

Dhananjayram Gadgil Library



GIPE-PUNE-024101

TRANSLATION.

In the Court of R. L. Yorke Esqr., I. C. S. Additional Sessions Judge Meerut.

In the case of King Emperor versus P. Spratt and others.

Examination of Arjun Atmaram Alwe, aged about 35 years before Mr. R. L. Yorke, Additional Sessions Judge, Meerut, on the 12 August 1931.

My name is Arjun, my father's name Atmaram, I am a Vaishya by caste and I am by birth a peasant and by circumstances a worker (weaver). My home is at Vasargaum, Savantwadi State, Police Station Kasal, District Ratnagiri and I reside in Bombay.

Q. On the 16th March 1931 your statement in the Lower Court P no. 2604 was read. Is it correct?

A. Yes,

Q. Have you anything to say regarding P 1353, 1348 (41 and 50), 1344, 1373 (14), 1375 and P. W. 244, 245, 273, 278, 276 showing your connection with the Workers' and Peasants' Party of Bombay?

A. Before explaining the documents presented against me I think that the charges brought against me cannot be properly explained unless I systematically relate how I was drawn into this movement. Therefore I shall first describe the circumstances in which I was situated and then explain (Lit survey) the charges brought against me. Among the evidence which has been attempted to be brought on behalf of the Prosecution to prove the charge of making conspiracy for subverting the Government of His Majesty the King Emperor, there is a point that I was spreading discontent among the Bombay mill workers, was organising them, was teaching them the principles of revolution (and) was gradually leading them to the path of revolution. The substance of a part of the charge is that without seeing whether the workers had got just grievances or not I incited the workers merely with the policy of revolution, declared a strike and prolonged it and in doing so I conspired to overthrow capitalism and the Government. I have to give the following reply regarding this. It is that it is totally wrong to use the language in my case that I came from somewhere outside and adopted the policy of inciting the workers and that I did not try to see or feel the necessity of seeing whether the workers had any grievances or complaints or not. Because, I am myself a mill worker as also a peasant. Therefore every movement in the mill area had its direct effect on my life. I am in a position to realize

more instantaneously and directly than others whether the owners did or did not cut the wages of us workers, whether they did or did not increase the hours of work, whether workers were harassed or not, whether their wages were withheld or not, whether the workers were beaten by the owners or not, whether they were forcibly made to work or not. To bring about a strike would have had its effect on my own wages, and to prolong it would have involved directly for me the sufferings of starvation. The evidence or the charge of my having got *jahagirs* or purses from anywhere for bringing about a strike or prolonging it, has not even been brought by the Prosecution. Therefore, unnecessarily prolonging the strike without any grievance would have meant that I followed the course of starving myself merely for the sake of fun. What reply is there for such a ridiculous charge? I am originally a peasant of Savantwadi. It is true that I am a landholder but the land is only a span in length. If money is borrowed from the money-lender for agricultural purpose it is not possible to get out of his interest of two rupees for one rupee during the whole of one's life. The produce would not even suffice for food. The Government revenue is to be paid out of it. I became a worker after coming to Bombay in a group of thousands of such peasants who, being unable to make their living, under such circumstances run to the cities leaving their villages. I was 8 years old when I became a worker and I used to get Rs 3. 8as as wages. Out of those wages I had every month to pay annas eight to the officers by way of bribe. On account of my circumstances I could not from my childhood get the opportunity of going to school or college. But I have completely passed in the study of oppression, having studied oppression in the oppressive college of rich. In the beginning I had to pay money to the officers in the mills to get employment and I could barely earn enough for dry bread for one time. When I began to work as a worker I have been directly subjected to the experiment of how the Bombay mill-owner persecutes the workers. Liquor had to be given to the officers in the mills in order to keep up the employment that had been secured. Similarly subscriptions in the name of a religious performance or in the name of entertaining the officials were forcibly taken from the workers and out of this money collected, the jobbers, headjobbers (direct) upto the Manager used to get plenty of gratifications, and liquor and the amount that was left went to the pockets of the respectable 'master'. The posts of most of the managers in the Bombay mills were in the hands of the Parsees and the Europeans, and they used to get money through the Indian 'masters'. Therefore besides taking money from the workers these mill officers did not hesitate even to attack the honour of women workers. A beautiful woman in the women's reeling or the winding department was

sure to fall prey to those oppressive officials within two to four months or she was sure to lose her employment and to be reduced to starvation. It was difficult to be acquainted with the children in the daylight once even in a month. The workers had to get up at 4 O'clock in the morning and to make preparations in the dark to go to the mills. You will see in Government reports a description of the over-crowding in the mill area. There were five hundred to thousand men packed up in one and the same chawl. The owner of such chawls set up one or two-taps of water and every worker had to keep a watch from 2 O'clock at night to get the water he could out of those taps. Similarly there were three or four latrines in that very chawl. If one got the latrine to answer the call of nature he could not get water and if one got water he could not get the latrine. Under such circumstances going through the affair some how every worker started towards the mills at the fixed time. The mill started at five in the morning was closed at nine at night. The whole body used to get contracted like a dead body after having worked for sixteen hours. Therefore the worker some how returned to his house with difficulty and eating what bread he could get, fell senseless on his bed. The children remained sleeping at the time of his leaving the house in the morning and they had gone to sleep before he came. The children could not even recognize their father as they were not able to see his face when they were awake. I who was driven away from my village on account of the land revenue of the Government, the clutches of the moneylenders debt, the debt due to famine, the dexterity of the rich to buy the produce at a cheaper rate when the crop was good and the scarcity of land, became a worker in place of a peasant. The owner of the land which I cultivated on rent paid Rs. 7/- as land revenue but he used to take from me Rs 58/- as the rent of that land. Even the whole grain that was produced could not be enough to pay these Rs 58 to him. But if all that grain had been given to him as rent what would that cultivator eat? It therefore becomes necessary to come to a city like Bombay and become a worker in order to raise money to pay that rent. (I) sold my sturdy physical power to the mill owner for wages. I worked the whole day and turned out a heap of goods worth hundreds of rupees but what was the return I got for it. The return was only the lashes of the whip of the oppressive officers (and) the forced contributions for their indulgence in liquor. The yarn could not work well because cheap dirty cotton was used. The yarn therefore got knotted and the cloth was spoiled. As a result of that, the whole wages were at times confiscated by way of fine. There was no leave for rest during all the twelve months. There was no arrangement for getting medicine if one fell sick. There was no leisure to see one's wife and children if ill at home. And

if one remained home under such circumstances he did not only fail to get work again but he did not even get wages for the work already done. If a machine was damaged while a worker was doing his work it was made good out of the wages of that worker and he was also driven away from work. If ever a complaint was made to the officials for any reason, the complaint was sure to receive booted kicks from them and if permission was not asked of them he was accused of doing work without receiving permission from them and was turned out from service. If a workman remained home for some important work for one day, his wages for two days were confiscated for his absence. If a workman was ever late by five minutes than the appointed time for going in the mills his wages for half the day were confiscated. And if there was a demand for the owner's goods, the very owner took additional work for two hours from the workers and did not give them anything in return for that additional work. And if a worker asked for some return for that work the worker who asked for it was sure to be driven away.

Cut in the workers' wages on account of the stupidity of the officials.

If there was a new officer and if he had not the proper knowledge of his work and if he committed a mistake, the workers were obliged to suffer for it. These officers in the mills used to be some relatives of the owners. They did not become officials as a result of their knowledge of the work. Therefore the workers used to be crushed on account of the mischievousness of the inexperienced and oppressive officials. These mill-officials compelled the workers to bring from the market, out of their own wages, lubricating oil, shuttles (Lit Pikas) for the looms, leather and other sundry articles if they got damaged. If a worker fell sick and died, his wages for the days he worked were not given to his wife and children. If the brother or the mother or the father of a workman died and leave was asked for one day to perform the obsequies it was not granted. It was necessary to keep the dead body rotting till the worker was free from his work. If a worker fell sick while doing his work he was not only not granted leave but he was not kept in service if he came back to work after recovery after a fortnight. Moreover the wages for the days for which he worked before falling sick were not also paid to him.

DECEIVING THE WORKERS BY FALSE RATES.

If there was one rate on the ticket of a worker there was another rate in the account books of the owners. For example if there was the rate of six pies per pound on the ticket of a worker the rate written in the account books of the owners was four and

a half pies. If calculations were made there was a loss of Rs. 5 to 6 during a month.

Disgraceful treatment of the women workers and their harassment.

If a woman was pregnant and if she asked for leave because the time of her delivery had come near, leave was not granted to her and she was not kept in service if she returned to work after one or two months after her delivery. But these oppressive officials of the mills used to disgrace her by asking questions like why she remained pregnant and who made her pregnant etc. This dishonour of women before (the worker's) eyes had to be silently seen and if the hand or the foot of a worker was caught in a machine or a belt and if it got cut off he became maimed for life and had to suffer starvation in the absence of compensation. I am a worker who have worked under such circumstances. These were the hardships of us workers on one side while on the other I have seen one and the same owner having two mills in place of one and ten in place of two, but even two pies in place of one were not made in my wages or the wages of us workers. If under such circumstances there appears to be anger towards ownership and hate towards the capitalists, in my words and thoughts, whose fault is it? What wonder is there? How we workers can feel love for the capitalists under such circumstances? And how can we praise them?

By what remedy this misfortune can be averted and this oppression of the officials on us workers will disappear?

This thought stood day and night before the eyes of us workers. And that time, that is in the year 1924 we had to go on strike to get reduced the hours of work which were sixteen, and that strike continued for 8 to 10 days and the hours of work came down from sixteen to twelve. But the hours of work were not brought to twelve in all the mills. Several mills worked for fourteen hours. I, therefore, realized in the year 1914 that the condition of us workers is somewhat improved by going on strike. So also a strike took place in the Currimbhoy Ibrahim Mill when I was working there in the year 1914. The men went on strike because the owners effected a cut in the rates of wages. At that time there were no leaders of us, the working class. And there were also no unions of the workers. Mr. Baptista used to come among workers, gave us some advice and held meetings of us workers. When the meeting of the men in the Currimbhoy group was held Mr. Baptista said to us "the strike cannot come to an end if you sit outside. Therefore select ten to twelve workers from

among you and I will come there to your owner." I was one of the ten or twelve. This our deputation of twelve persons went to see the owners with the grievances of the workers. We reached the owner's bungalow at 11 (A.M.) but his watchman, a Pathan, did not allow us to go in. Thereafter somehow making him understand matters and telling that we had come to see the owner, the secretary of the owner came to see us and on listening to what we said, allowed us to sit in the garden. We who had gone there at 11 A. M. were sitting up to 5 P. M. We remained waiting with the idea in our mind that the owner will talk with us now or a little later. But Mr. Baptista who suggested us the device did not even come and the owner also did not meet us. But by 5-30 or 5-45 (P.M.) two sergeants and a Police party came there and began to threaten us. Then we explained to them that we had been there to see the owner. But without minding what we were telling them they at once ordered us to go out and the experiment of lathi was made on us. Seven from among us ran away and the Police arrested the five persons, took them to the Police station, gave two to three slaps on my face and began to abuse me by asking me whether we were not the *sons of Bajirao* etc. and warned us "Beware if you come at any time from today to the owner's house. The owner is not ready to talk with worthless men like you.

*Used in bad sense in connection with officious persons.

Therefore we pardon you for once and release you. Do not now try to come to the owner's house again in this manner." After giving this warning we were released at about 9 o'clock at night. This was the first disposal of the deputation of us workers. We workers were beaten on all sides in this manner and at that time there was no one to champion the cause of the worker. Cries like those when a man dies were heard on all sides after going home. Some one cried because the owner turned him out from work while another cried because he stopped his payment. Under these pitiable circumstances there was no way whatsoever for the workers to get out. After that some men came forward in 1915 who said that a Union of the workers should be started. Mr. Baptista was also among them. He used to go from house to house and asked us workers why we did not start a union to stop the oppression of the owners. But at that time we did not know what a union meant. Then it was explained to us what a union was and what was meant by a union. We thought that there was some truth in what they said and a beginning was made to start a union. That Union was started in Kumbhar Chawl, Currey Road and an office under the title "Kamgar Sangha" was opened. Every member was required to pay one rupee every year. And we were told that there would be no oppression on us so long as the receipt of the Union was with us. And that we should come to their Union with the

receipt when the owner might turn them out from work or when he might withhold their wages. Then they would remove all our difficulties. The saying "Pay a rupee and get comforts and conveniences" was current at that time. The workers thinking that if the owners' oppression would cease by paying one rupee why should a rupee not be paid (and) every one paid one rupee each to the Union. Even those who had not got it paid it to the Union by borrowing it from the grocer or the Marwari (moneylender) at the interest of one anna. There was a great commotion among the workers that time that their grievances would disappear by paying one rupee. This campaign of paying a rupee continued for fifteen to twenty days. For, during that campaign I was going about in the workers' locality with a board advising "Pay a rupee and get comforts and conveniences". Then, I am of opinion that twenty five to thirty thousand men became members as a result of these our efforts. But when the owners knew this thing they began to dismiss every person who had become a member of that Union. The office was closed when the dismissed men came to the office. Only the board of the office was on the outside. There was no person in the office. No one knew where the organizers of the Union resided. The result was that the workers lost both the rupee and their employment. From that time the workers could not place confidence in such outside leaders. If any leader came among them and began to tell them anything, the workers beat him and turned him out. Such was the state of things that time. Then came period of the War, that is in the year 1916 the Bombay Police started the campaign of recruiting men for the War. The workers were advised at the Mill-gates and in the workers' chawls to go to War. I thought to myself that time, that service in the army was better than the service of the oppressive owner causing starvation. Moreover an opportunity would be had for showing valour and benefiting oneself for life. With this thought in my mind and with my mind overflowing with love for the *Mabap* Government, I became a sepoy from a worker and I advised the worker brothers working near about me to become sepoys and go to the War. Following that advice of mine we one hundred and thirty persons enlisted ourselves at one and the same time. Now it is better not to describe my War experience that is what became the plight of the sepoys that time, what hardships they had to undergo and how many persons were killed. But one feels tremor as soon as the scene of that time stands today before one's eyes. The War was over. The work of the *Mabap* Government was over and all my sweet dreams disappeared. This means that the additional army raised for the War was disbanded, (and) I was also included among those disbanded and I again began to work, becoming a worker from a sepoy. The working class got scorched in the tumult of

War. Lakhs of European workers and peasants were killed on the battle-field, so also Indian workers and peasants were killed in the same proportion, but our mill-owners alone became richer out of the devilish fire of the War. The prices of Indian goods increased on account of the stoppage of foreign goods at the time of the War. The mill industry specially prospered extraordinarily. The owners earned as many as thousand rupees on a capital of hundred rupees during war time. The pre-war situation in which the English capitalists had the upper hand of the Indian capitalists in the textile trade changed and the Bombay mill-owners became powerful masters of the cloth market. But what profit did we workers earn in this matter? Prices of articles increased everywhere as a result of the War. A famine took place in the meanwhile, the house rents also went up, that is where the workers paid five or six rupees as room-rent they were required to pay the increased rent of ten to twelve rupees for the same room. So also the rates of grain went up. Sundry articles and cloth became doubly dear. There was no department that time in the Bombay Presidency recording this increase in the cost of living. The Bombay Government opened in 1921 a department doing such work. It appears from the statistics of that Department that, where in 1914 an expenditure of Rs100 was required, in 1919 it rose up to Rs. 175/- (and) in 1920 to Rs183/- were required. This means that the cost of living almost doubled itself. Did the wages of the workers go on increasing while the prices continued to increase in this manner? No. The workers had to suffer the starvation due to the increasing cost of living. They had to remain half-starved. They incurred debts but the prices continued to go up. At last being helpless the workers had to resort to the weapon of a strike. But were the wages adequate for the increasing cost of living even after the strike? No, that was not so. For, even before the year 1914 the workers' wages had been inadequate for the increased cost of living. Even supposing that the wages before 1914 and the cost of living were on the same level and taking into account the increase in the cost of living an inadequate increase in wages was granted to the workers after the strike. In this manner if the cost of living went up to 175 in 1919 the revised wages of the workers reached only up to 135. When a strike was declared again the cost of living had gone up to 183 and the owners increased the wages of the workers to 155. But two rupees in place of one were required for household expenses on account of the increase of market rates. That time an increase of twelve annas per rupee was granted. That too was got by the workers in 1921 after making a strike. You will understand from this account how the owners compelled the workers to go on strike even in such a prosperous time of theirs. These strikes of the workers are not at all meant to overthrow the Govt. of H. M. But the workers are

obliged to resort to this weapon of a strike out of helplessness only because they may be able to get a few more rupees and be able to live as human beings. What are we to do during such a time and how are we to fill our belly? Those who know economic statistics, point out that if the difference between the increased cost of living since 1914 and the low wages of the workers is taken into account, every worker must have balanced his expenses by incurring debt. Otherwise the Bombay mill-workers might have been required to incur debts to the extent of ten crores of rupees to balance the workers' wages with the increasing market rates. As a matter of fact how can the workers have the ability of raising such a loan? Some men incurred debts while some remained half-starved. You will come to know from the Labour Report and from the Report of the Tariff Board that during this very time, that is during the War time, apart from the loot going on by way of reserve fund, secret deposits etc the owners made a profit of fifty-two crores of rupees. While our struggle against starvation was going on in this manner, the drum of political agitation was being beaten in the country. The Congress started a great agitation demanding rights for India to conduct her own administration. At that time we workers and peasants understood the meaning of this demand for Swaraj to be only this that our indebtedness would disappear, the oppression of the money-lenders would stop, we would get lands at cheaper rates, our wages would increase and the oppression of the owner on the workers, the kicks and blows with which they belabour us would stop by legislation and that as a result of it the persecution of us workers would come to an end. These and other thoughts came in the minds of us workers and a good many workers from among us and I myself enlisted ourselves as volunteers in this movement. When I began liquor shop picketing the experience I got at that time is as follows. Those rich persons who supported this movement were themselves earning money out of the profits of the liquor traffic and were themselves respectable drunkards. Similarly while putting on Swadeshi khaddar they carried on the business of foreign cloth, but cried out in meetings that people should not buy foreign cloth, declared some piece of cloth with us poor workers as foreign and compelled us to burn it. Those very patriots did not prohibit the use of foreign cloth for their wives and children. When this sort of patriotism became absolutely clear to me and to us workers, I and the workers working with me bade good bye to the Swaraj movement. But the Indian capitalists (Lit. owners) and leaders posing themselves as nationalists blame the workers for taking liquor. The owners want to show that the workers are given adequate wages but that they drink liquor and squander all of them. Similarly the patriots also make against us workers the same charge. But no one considers what wages the

workers get and how they can afford to drink liquor. Liquor does not mean water from the rivers. Will a worker earning at the most eighteen to twenty rupees a month think of solving the problem of the livelihood of himself, his wife and his children or drink liquor? Besides this he has to spend out of those wages for room rent, clothing and medical help, how can he drink liquor? How can the worker over-worked on account of the oppression of the owner, and passing the days of his life in a half-starved condition drink this mine of vices? Only the rich can do it. And even supposing that the worker drinks liquors, this childish movement cannot stop liquor drinking merely by saying that liquor should not be taken. It must be seen why he jumps into this mine of vices and what are the causes for it. But our patriots or the Congress calling itself National have never even cared to look at the condition of us poor workers and peasants. But we workers are straightway charged with being drunkards. If these patriots would see the condition of the place where the worker lives they can easily understand why the workers takes to drink. The latrines are not cleaned for fortnights together, the gutters are not cleaned, ten to twelve persons live in one room, there are epidemics, on all sides there are cries of men having died and the groanings of men on the death-bed, there is bad smell everywhere, the workers are indebted to the Bania, the Marwadi (and) the Pathan because they do not get wages sufficient to fill the belly and have no money for medicine, and the creditor is standing at the door of the worker to recover his debts, women and children have no clothes on their body, they are in a naked condition, there is no food in the house. The worker jumps into this filth being unable to bear this condition before his eyes and being tired of his circumstances. And he is unable to find a way out of those circumstances and there is no champion of his to show him the way. So he behaves thoughtlessly and reduces his family life to dust. But who causes this? These oppressive owners (are the cause of it). Liquor cannot therefore be stopped by oral learned advice. The worker must get clean quarters, be required to work for a smaller number of hours, be given wages adequate for the livelihood of his wife and children. Then his habit of taking liquor, opium, cocaine etc. will stop. These patriots and the Congress calling itself national have so far made no efforts at all to improve the economic condition of the worker. No change in the condition of the workers can be brought about merely by asking them orally not to drink liquor and to use Swadeshi (articles). (To be continued).

Sd/- R. L. Yorke

Sd/- K. S. A.

12.8.31

Alwe (Contd).

PICKETING FOREIGN CLOTH SHOPS

After being free from the tumult of War, the foreign capitalists began to throw their goods on India at cheap rates and on long term credits. At that time as soon as the profits began to be reduced the eyes of these Indian capitalists addicted to excessive profiteering for seven years turned towards the agitation for Swaraj and the boycott of foreign goods became strong on their behalf and before our own eyes heaps of goods accumulated in every mill began to be cleared off at great speed and night shifts also were started. But the wages of us workers were in no way increased. And in every mill men had to go on strikes on a small scale to get their wages increased. We workers therefore became of opinion that boycott cannot be of any profit to us workers, it was only the dodge of the mill-owners and the Indian rich men. The agitation in 1921-22 got strength because of the conjunction of the three factors, of the worker and the peasant class being enraged on account of the universal high prices caused by famine and the War and because of the Indian capitalist being enraged because of the onslaught of European capitalists on India. But the eyes of us urban workers alone began to open as stated above. We peasants were advised not to pay land revenue only to the Govt. but we peasants cultivat-

*A particular
tenure prevalent
in Konkan.

ing *Khoti lands on rent were strangled by those Khots in the country itself and though the money-lenders got themselves acclaimed in the meetings and received garlands and bouquets these Khots of the country were not ready even to remit a pie out of our interest. The Khots started great agitation for the reduction of the land revenue and in some provinces the Govt. granted remission in land revenue but these landlords instead of reducing the rent taken from us began day by day to increase its burden. It therefore became evident to me what Swaraj was and what would be the condition of us workers and peasants when it would come into the hands of such richmen. Though I myself and nearly all the working class became ready to bid good-bye to this movement for Swaraj still the oppression of rich men and the owners on us and the thoughts of being free from their grievous persecution had not disappeared from our minds.

INSTANCES OF OPPRESSION BY OWNERS.

I wish to cite here one or two instances of how these owners oppress us workers and how (oppression) was inflicted on me. In 1921 I was working in the Pearl Mill. My brother was also working there. All of a sudden he fell sick while working. I communicated the news of his sickness to the officers. But the mill-officials did not allow him to go out of the mill. And he remained

lying in that mill in the same condition. He had got 108° fever and he had to remain in the mill in this condition till the mill was closed. I took him home in the evening after the mill was closed and he expired within an hour or two. You will come to know from this instance how these mill-officials placed difficulties in the way of providing for the convenience of the sick or giving medicines to them. But when he died, the owners did not pay the wages for the days for which he had worked even though I demanded them. I was working in the Wadia mill in 1922 and my sister was also working in the same mill. She also died one night as a result of the attack of an epidemic. I had to stay at home in the morning to perform her obsequies. I was turned out on the plea that I did not go to the mill to ask for leave in the morning, and my wages also were not paid.

In 1923 I was working in the Garden mill. There I fell sick and so I could not attend work. I went to work after five or six days when I became all right. But I was neither given work nor the wages for the days for which I had worked. Such was at that time the condition of us workers. It will amount to a bulky volume if I go on citing such instances of the oppression of the owners. I have, therefore, concisely shown by way of an instance the manner in which the workers are oppressed by the owners.

|| The year 1923 commenced. That year the owners raised the outcry that they had begun to incur loss and they stopped the bonus that was given to the workers. Bonus means one month's wages for the twelve months' work. The owners grumble at the time of increasing the wages of us workers even when they are making profits. They however require no time when the wages of the workers are to be cut down. All the owners prepare notices in one night and suddenly attack the workers without giving time to think saying "Your wages have been cut, you may stay if you want to continue on reduced wages, if not you may go away." Bonus was given to such workers alone as might have attended their work throughout in the mill of one owner for twelve months of the year, without remaining at home. Thus we were plainly told in the twelfth month when the time came to pay the bonus, after taking work from the workers for eleven months, that bonus would not be paid to us. On hearing this the working class which was already involved in debt and high prices, became irritated and went on strike. The particular difference between the strikes that had taken place up-till-now that is those of 1919, 20, 21, and the two subsequent strikes, was that the strikes from 1914 to 1921 took place during the days of excessive profiteering on the part of the owners. So the workers could get at least some increase

in their wages in order that the owners may not lose their increasing profit, the strikes had not to be fought out to the bitter end and during these strikes there were no permanent special Unions or organizations for conducting them. Therefore men used to wander at will in all directions in an unorganized and uncontrolled manner. And every man was ready to act according to his desire. On all sides, looting, incendiarism, stone-throwing and beating was the programme during those strikes. And *Badmashes* and thieves carried out their objects taking advantage of this strike of the workers. Therefore the Bombay Govt. was required to call for the military as soon as such strikes of the workers took place and in the strike of 1923 also similar steps were adopted, and the strike began to assume a terrible form. I was as that time working in the Crown mill. There was danger even in going out, there were riots, mutual fighting and looting on every side and firing was resorted to everywhere. On seeing this condition I thought to myself what the reason for which we declared the strike was and the form it began to assume and that if this condition continued in the same manner we workers would suffer terribly and that therefore somehow must be found out of this condition and the chaos that prevailed, must be stopped and I thought in my mind that (I should place before the people and the Govt.) the reason why our strike took place and its cause and should ask for redress. I communicated these my thoughts to my worker brothers. On their approval of those ideas, we contributed one anna each and published leaflets giving detailed information about the strike. The worker brothers were requested in that handbill: "Our strike was declared because the owners stopped our bonus and lawful means must be adopted to get it back. And therefore worker brothers should immediately give up the thoughtless path of beating etc. resorted to by them. We workers are neither rebels nor have we declared the strike to raise a rebellion but we have gone on strike because the owners stopped our bonus. My worker brothers should therefore listen to my request and attend the meeting near Rama's temple at Naigam. And on gathering there, there will be a consideration about our strike." As a result of my request about fifty to sixty thousand persons assembled there. I placed the first resolution at that time before the men that if they wanted their bonus they must at once stop the disorder going on everywhere in the city of Bombay. It was their first duty that day to establish peace. The question of their bonus would not be considered at all as long as peace was not established. I tried to establish peace by getting such resolutions passed in that meeting and by distributing handbills everywhere. And peace was established as a result of my request. While I was carrying on this programme of mine, Sir George Lloyd, the Governor of Bombay called me to see him. That time a deputation of

eighteen persons consisting of myself, Messrs. Bhatavdekar, Mayekar, Kusgaonkar, Parulekar and other workers. went there to see him. When we saw him (he) asked me who Mr. Alwe was and I gave him information that I was a worker. Taking in hand the handbills issued by me asking the workers to establish peace (he) asked me whether I had distributed them among the workers. I then gave a connected account and he said that he was thankful to me for the trouble taken by me to keep peace and for my efforts to place forward the real side of the workers. After this thanksgiving was over I was asked why I did not establish Unions of workers. I then placed before him all the difficulties, (describing) how the owners hampered us in establishing unions and how membership of a union involved loss of employment. Then H. E. the Governor told me that my fears were out of place, that if the owners dismissed us from work as soon as a Union was started we should forthwith communicate with His Excellency's Secretariat, that the workers must necessarily have a union and that a union of workers made it very easy to carry on negotiations with the owners through the Unions, in matters like a strike and made it possible for Govt. to understand clearly what both the sides had to say. His Excellency asked us to establish a union that very day without having any misgivings in mind and said that he approved of our workers' union.

On the next day in December 1923, was born the Girni Kamagar Mahamandal. This was the very first union (lit. institution) among the workers of Bombay. Owing to our previous experience up till then, we had no confidence especially in outside leaders, therefore, the Girni Kamagar Mahamandal was a union purely conducted by the working class and I was elected the President of that Union. The next day after the election I received a letter from H.E. the Governor. I went to see him and when we began to talk about the strike the question was asked me: "I suggest you one plan. That plan is that the strike must be ended soon by some compromise. That is my desire. Do you approve of these my thoughts?" When asked thus I replied that we must have our bonus and that I was thankful that His Excellency was trying to secure it for us. After some talk thereafter, a suggestion was brought forward that the quarrel between the owners and the workers should be entrusted to a committee and that the decision of the Committee would be binding on both the parties. At that time I somewhat liked this suggestion and I accepted it as President of the workers' Girni Kamagar Mahamandal. Then this Bonus affair was sent to a Committee of a High Court Judge, along with the municipal commissioner and a merchant. The committee was appointed solely in order to see whether the bonus being given to the workers was proper and whether the owners were then making a profit, and

the representatives of both the owners and the workers were to place their respective sides before that committee. Then on behalf of the workers I placed before the committee some typical statistics as to how low were the wages being then received by the workers and how the owners were making profit. I submitted to the committee a brief account of how the wages then being paid to the workers were inadequate for their maintenance, how they had to incur debt, and how the worker class owing to indebtedness falls a victim to the Marwadi and the Pathan (money-lenders). And the inquiry committee also saw after being shown by me, how inadequate were the wages received then by the workers, owing to the high cost of living in Bombay then. But the owners produced before the committee for giving evidence some witnesses, which they had won over to their side, making them to appear as workers. These gave evidence quite contrary (to the truth) and their evidence was considered as true by the committee. Similarly on behalf of the workers, Messrs. Bole, Talcherkar and others (of workers' institutions like the 'Hitwardhak' (Samaj) put together something and placed it before the committee and these sensible and humanitarian persons represented as false the side of the workers placed by me over to their side, got it proclaimed through the English newspapers that they were the real leaders of the workers that I knew nothing about the workers' condition and such other things. The committee also accepted as true their side, regarding them as sensible outsiders. The owners placed before the committee accounts showing loss to themselves in the matter of their failing to get profits. At that time Mr. Findlay Shirras gave evidence on behalf of the Labour Office of the Govt. He hinted a bit concealingly that the accounts of the owners were not reliable, that is, they were false. But his evidence also was not accepted by the committee and in the end it stopped the bonus of us workers. Mill-owner Wadia raised a storm against Mr. Shirras in the Bombay Council because he had unmistakably expressed an opinion adverse to the owners. Since then Mr. Shirras learned a good lesson, so much so that henceforward he began unmistakably and whole heartedly to work against the workers. The owners were sure that the workers would go on strike after they were deprived of the bonus, and they were determined not to recede even if the men went on strike. That is why the strike of 1923 got prolonged for many days.

The strike of 1919, in which 35 per cent was secured as high cost allowance, the strike of 1920, in which 55 per cent was secured as high cost allowance and the 1921 strike in which 75 per cent was secured as high cost allowance, lasted for ten, eighteen, and twenty days (respectively). But the strike of 1923 lasted for one

month and a half. And the strike question went before this committee and the bonus was stopped. The owners did not insist during the 1923 strike as they did in that of 1928, that the strike must be called off before an inquiry took place. Because in the absence of organisation there was no champion of the workers to place forward their side. Then as I have already said, an institution by name the Girni Kamgar Mahamandal came into existence and the complaints of the workers began to be placed before the owners through that Mandal. But, as many complaints were not listened to as ought to have been. Several owners used to dismiss workers if they became members of the Mandal. In this way the oppression against the workers, instead of ceasing, went on increasing. Because organization is to be made for opposing oppression and if that is made, the worker is dismissed from work. In such difficulties the year 1924 passed off somehow. In 1925 the owners again attacked our wages. The reason was that the Govt. did not agree to the demand being made for several years by the owners that the Govt. should repeal the duty of $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent imposed by it on the mill products of India. The anger against the Govt. was vented (by them) on us workers. And a cut of $11\frac{1}{2}$ per cent was effected in the wages of the workers. As the owners had not the strength to fight against the power of the Govt., they kicked at the bellies of the poor, and began an outcry that they were suffering great loss. And notices were posted on every mill door that the wages of all the workers would be cut down by $11\frac{1}{2}$ per cent and it was also written in that notice that so long as the Govt. did not repeal the $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent duty, on the owners, they would not restore the cut in the wages of the workers. In such circumstances the strike began in September 1925. At that time it was not necessary for any institution or leader to tell the workers to go on strike, because, the owners had placed clear notices on mill doors that a cut of $11\frac{1}{2}$ per cent would be effected in the wages of the workers. So it was not at all necessary to explain the thing to the worker, (similarly) it was not that it affected particular workers and did not affect others, or there were no complications in it. That was not the state of things in the strike of 1928, the state of things in that strike was quite different. Now the reasons are different why it was necessary in the year 1928 to ask the workers to go on strike, as we shall see later on. But when the strike of 1925 took place I went to the mill-owners' Association in order to have a talk about the strike, on behalf of the G. K. Maha Mandal. But there was absolutely no use of that my going. Therefore it being decided on behalf of the Maha Mandal that the strike must be fought out till the cut of $11\frac{1}{2}$ per cent was restored, the G. K. Maha Mandal took the leadership of the strike. I have already said that the G. K. Maha Mandal was a Union purely of workers, which means that all the strings of

that strike lay in the hands of the Maha Mandal. Then Mr. (N. M.) Joshi approached our Maha Mandal on behalf of the Social Service League and introduced the talk that a committee should be appointed to conduct the strike. I know Mr. Joshi since that time. Till then Mr. Joshi had never come in the workers' movement. I know Mr. Jhabwala since 1920. He used to come among us workers and tell (us) the importance of the power of organization. Thereafter Messrs. Bole, Talcherkar, Asavale, Jinwala, all joined (us), and a Joint Strike Committee got formed to conduct the strike of 1925. Mr. Joshi was taken on the committee as representative of the Social Service League. Similarly, Mr. Jhabwala was taken on the committee as secretary of the G. I. P. Union. Messrs. Asavale and Bakhale were chosen for this committee as advisers of Mr. Joshi. Mr. Jinwala was selected as representative of the B. B. & C. I. Union. Mr. Bole was taken as representative of the Kamagar Hitwardhak Samaj. Thereafter all the strings of the strike were moved by this Joint Strike Committee. But while forming this committee the majority of the members were representatives of the Maha Mandal, and they were all workers. Then H. E. the Governor called (us) in order to have a talk about the strike. At that time I was appointed on behalf of the G. K. Maha Mandal and along with me there were Messrs. Joshi, Bakhale, Jhabwala, Mayekar and Asavale. But nothing satisfactory came out even from that interview, and this strike became obstinate. Rs. 25000 were received as help for that strike from British workers. Similarly the Bombay municipality had laid down a scheme of providing work to the strikers to the extent of one lakh of rupees as help to the strike. When the workers thus got help on all sides the owners thought that the strike would not break and so the millowners made an outcry with the Govt. of India (lit. Delhi Govt.) that this indigenous industry would now be ruined. They waited that if Govt. wanted their industry to survive it should grant them reduction of duty otherwise they could not afford to restore the cut in the workers' wages. In the end after the owners got an assurance from the Govt. that it would repeal the 3½ per cent of duty they began to talk with our Joint Strike Committee about a compromise and began to say that they would restore the cut of 11½ percent in our wages. Of course, our strike that had taken place because of the 11½ per cent cut was called off after 3½ months in all, after a talk with the owners that it would be called off if our wages were going to be restored. Though this strike in the year 1925 became successful, all that happened was that cut of 11½ per cent was abolished. The mill-owners, however, found out an altogether new way of cutting the wages of the workers. This being a clandestine way, it took much time for the workers to realise it and the strike

of 1928 took place merely because of that clandestine attack. Now before telling what happened next, I must tell here what was the state of my ideas (lit. thought) (from time to time). And the necessity for telling this is that, it has been alleged with respect to me that I have taken my ideas from the Communists, similarly that I was taught the principles of the Communist Inter-National and that by joining the Communists or by bringing

My Ideas, them among the workers (1) made a conspiracy Not Communist. to subvert the *Raj*. The real beginning of this charge is taken back to the Russian Revolution and to the establishment of the Communist International and the Prosecution has also produced evidence to that effect. But it has been nowhere mentioned what I was since my birth to my arrest and what was the line of my work. The charge of conspiracy has been foisted upon me by bringing together some sort of similarity in thought, some (rare) identity of words and some occasional meetings between persons that took place for a particular purpose. Now I do not know what is communism and what is called by that name. Similarly I have no information what this Communist International is, similarly I have no idea who Lenin was. Similarly till this case was started I had no idea of what is meant by (saying) that a revolution took place in Russia, and I do not know yet. But, it appears to me desirable to show here how my ideas (lit. thoughts) went on developing independently from 1923 till my arrest. Because this development of my ideas (lit. thought) did not take place because of any one's incitement or teaching but because of the experience I actually got and the sufferings that I had to bear. As I was a peasant (I knew) the difficulties of my family with respect to agriculture, the exploitation by money-lenders, the loot of us (tenants) by the Khot, the prices of our grain being cut down by the rich Marwadis in the Bazar, all these schemes (were known to me). The Government helped the rich directly or indirectly, so that we peasants had no friend, all were our enemies, the khots, the money-lenders, the marwadis all persecuted and plundered (lit. eat) us. Such was the impression formed by me and by us peasants. Similarly after coming to the city and becoming a worker, I experienced the whole situation—the attack on our wages by the mill-owners and their officials, work till the bones broke, kicking with boots by the officials, the whole wages (taken) as fine on some minor excuse, cruel beating, our housing conditions like those of beasts, work ten times that of a prisoner taken forcibly (from us), such sufferings of us workers, while the owners were making excessive profit. I (then) began to think—I saw that the owner in the city too batters by spoiling us workers. Hearing it being taught that we should fight for the protection of *ma bab sarkar* and because the King was in danger

I went to war, but what happened there was that the Government for whose protection we fought that same Government, instead of providing us for life, threw me again into the jaws (lit. stomach) of hunger (and) unemployment and I found myself again in the oppressive clutches of the capitalist. Then I began to see the Government partiality (lit. attraction) towards the rich and their indifference towards us poor. (to be continued).

Sd/- K. S. A.

Sd/- R. L. YORKE.

13-8-31.

Alwe [continued].

For, when the owners cut the wages of us workers or increase the hours of work, we have to declare a strike to oppose that oppression. The Police run to the help of the owners during those strike days and belabour the workers in order to break their strike, forcibly arrest the workers and cause them to work on wages reduced by the owners. [They] entered the workers' chawls and, made lathi charges on them, came to meetings and created confusion, began to kill the workers by firing on them, they arrested the workers and began to hold threats of imprisonment, began to drive lorries on the workers while they were peacefully going home, began to beat volunteers while they were peacefully picketing at the mill gates, began to dishonour women volunteers: on seeing these things everywhere hateful abuses automatically came out from my mouth as a result of anger in my speeches during the strike. I also abused the administration being sick of the circumstances of that time and being unable to bear the persecution to which we workers were subjected at that time. Those speeches of mine were not intended to spread among the people disaffection towards the Government, but love about the Government began to disappear from my mind and that of us workers because the Government did not at all intervene during the strike situation and began freely to beat the workers without even making the attempt of mediation and without seeing whether the complaint of the workers was proper or not or whether the owners persecuted the workers or not. The experience I gathered on going to the War was as follows:— The poor workers and peasants stand to gain nothing in these wars that are fought and the lives of these workers and peasants are sacrificed for the profit of the rich. And these very rich men bring about such terrible wars and sacrifice crores of workers and peasants on the battlefield for their (own) profit. It is therefore that the worker and the peasant is against such wars. So also the workers at least are not generally ready to declare a strike and to adopt the path of starvation. But these rich men force

the workers to adopt that path. Then being helpless and tired of their circumstances the workers go on strike. But in truth the worker is against adopting such methods as that of going on strike. Then these patriots under the name of politics and the pretence of patriotism raise waves and storms for their profit. And rob the profit for themselves making a puppet of the workers and the peasants for that purpose and throwing them into the jaws of the Government. I clearly got this experience in the agitation of 1921-22 and in the agitation of the 1925 strike for the repeal of the 3½ per cent excise duty. This was the pitiable state of society and when it was asked how the hardships of the workers can be removed, people used to say: "Form unions (and) organise. There are big unions of the workers in England and those unions have got large funds, the unions are useful when those workers fight with the owners and they succeed as a result of it." These and other things were told to us workers. And the mill-owners also said that if there were a proper union of the workers they would keep themselves in touch with it. On hearing these things we workers inaugurated the Girni Kamgar Mahamandal in 1923. But not a single mill-owner was ready either to confer with the workers' union or to send a reply to letters from the workers. But a worker was however turned out from work if he became a member of the Mahamandal. The work of the Mahamandal was somehow carried on under these circumstances. Now I think I should relate here in short how difference of opinion arose between myself and outside sensible and respectable leaders like Messrs. Joshi and Jinwala. For, in the Lower Court the Magistrate has accused me of keeping aloof from respectable leaders like Messrs. Joshi and Jinwala. As this charge has been brought against me, I am obliged to say something in that connection. I myself and Messrs. Joshi, Jinwala, Bakhle, Jhabwala, Asavle, Bole, and Mayekar unitedly fought the general strike of 1925 against the cut of 11½ per cent. But as soon as the strike was over, Mr. Joshi suggested that a union should be started by all of them and his suggestion was approved by all of us. But Mr. Joshi's suggestion was to dissolve the Girni Kamgar Mahamandal that was conducted by mill-workers and to establish a new union altogether. That time I opposed Mr. Joshi's suggestion thus:— "Mr. Joshi's suggestion that there should be only one union of all the workers is excellent. But the union that has been conducted by the workers since 1923 should be kept intact and all should unitedly work on its behalf. New election should be made if desired, but I am quite opposed to Mr. Joshi's suggestion of dissolving a union that has been going on for two years and of establishing a new one." At that time this question was discussed in the Joint-Strike-Committee of 1925, Mr. Joshi's resolution for dissolving the

Mahamandal and inaugurating a new union was thrown out and it was resolved by all to carry on unitedly and vigorously the work of organising the workers under the auspices of (lit. sitting in) the Mahamandal. Then Mr. Joshi moved that the rule of the Girni Kamgar Mahamandal that there should be no outside leader in it, should be cancelled, as that rule was destructive to outside men like himself. I had also opposed that resolution that time thus:—

“We workers have been compelled to frame such a rule on account of the experiences about outsiders got by us. If educated outsiders want to show the way of the uplift of us workers they should show it by coming to the institutions of us workers as advisers. But they should not become masters of the institutions of us workers. For, when they become the office-bearers of the institution of us workers and when the question of us workers is placed before the owners, such educated outsiders do not exactly know the real condition of the working class, what their grievances are and how pressing they are today. On account of this, pressing questions of the working class remain aside and the outsiders open talks with the owners regarding some other questions and we workers incur great loss as a result of it. These outsiders do not intentionally put the workers to loss but comes about on account of their ignorance of the real condition of the workers. The real question is not solved by their talking something by mere conjecture. When we knew this and received actual experience, we, men of the working class thought over the matter and resolved that the leadership of the workers’ union must be in the hands of the workers and that educated outsiders may help the working class as advisers if they please. Control should not be placed in the hands of outsiders. The workers’ unions and the work that is done on their behalf constitute the question of the welfare of the working class and the improvement of their economic condition. Therefore the working class knows better than educated outsiders what improvement ought to be effected in its economic condition. This is not a great political question so that big *shastris* and *pandits* are required to solve it. We were compelled to pass such a resolution with the only object in mind that the condition of us workers might some how improve. But the question that stood before Mr. Joshi was merely that of honour and not that of the welfare or the economic condition of the workers. And while placing his side before the committee he said that the authority of these unions of the workers should be in their (of the educated outsiders) hands. When we saw this autocratic obstinacy of Mr. Joshi it became evident that Mr. Joshi had in truth only been enticed by the posts of authority in the Worker’s Unions and that instead of doing any real work he wanted only to parade the leadership of the Worker’s Unions. And a discussion took place

about that question, that is about the posts of authority in the Workers' Unions and Mr. Joshi's suggestion that educated outsiders should be the officials in the Worker's Unions, was also thrown out. At that time Messrs. Joshi, Bakhale, Asavle and Jinwala walked out of the meeting and inaugurated an independent union. This was the Textile Labour Union and it was started in the month of January 1926. Thus there came to be two Unions of us mill-workers. Therefore if there was any difference of opinion between Mr. Joshi and myself it was for this reason only that while Mr. Joshi wanted to parade himself in the name of the workers, at Geneva and in the Legislative Assembly, as the office-bearer of Trade Unions and the representative of workers, I thought that actual workers ought to go there as the representatives of workers. This was the only difference of opinion between us two. Still whenever a question like that of a strike cropped up, Mr. Joshi and myself used to work with thorough unanimity. Such work was done even in the strike of 1928 by forming a Joint Strike Committee. Now I shall describe afterwards how the Joint-Strike Committee of 1928 was formed.

Now I want to go back and tell something about the Tariff Board of 1926. After the strike of 1925 for the restoration of the cut of 11½ per cent was won, the owners were waiting for an opportunity to take revenge on the workers, revenge for their having won the strike. At that time that is in 1926 the mill-owners represented to the Govt. that the condition of their industry was not satisfactory and that the Govt. should appoint a Board to see how bad was the condition of their industry and should see what ruinous condition it had reached. The Govt. listened to this wail of the mill-owners and the Tariff Board was appointed to see the condition of their industry. While this Board was surveying the condition of the textile industry of the owners, they placed their side before it and did not especially forget to point out to the Board how they were required to pay high wages to the workers. Therefore (they urged) "Some cut must be effected in the worker's wages and the Board should recommend that such a cut should be effected, then we would see how the worker can live in this world. Because the worker is very insolent, he does not allow us to cut down his wages and as soon as wages are cut down he goes on strike and maintains the strike not for a few days but for three to four months continuously and compels us to accept defeat. The workers are able to maintain these strikes because we pay them more money. We must therefore cut down their wages. And if you would allow the workers to indulge in their domineering behaviour in this manner they will not fail to sit even on the head of the Govt. after some time (Lit. tomorrow)." "

Such perverted facts were at that time being placed before the Tariff Board on behalf of the owners. (They said:) "As the work that is being done by the workers at present is quite inadequate for those workers, it will be necessary for us to effect changes in their work also. It is possible to get done the work even if we appoint one person where two are working today. For it will be feasible if we take from one the work of two persons and (thereby) our industry will also derive some help. Therefore if you recommend some cut in the wages of the workers, then we will see. When this is done we will not have much to complain against the duty and the tax imposed by the Govt. And if the question at all remains, we and the Govt. shall see to it. But you (The Tariff Board) must recommend retrenchment in the case of the wages and the work of the workers. Then we are going to give effect to a new scheme which is called the Standardization scheme and which is in operation today in Lancashire and Japan. The workers will not only not say anything when we introduce that scheme in India but they will not also get an opportunity to grumble against it. And this scheme is highly excellent, for, as a result of it the workers will get ample work and we shall also gain our object." This idea in the fertile brain of the owners was also appreciated by the Board and the Tariff Board remarked in its Report that changes might be effected in the work of the workers by way of protection to the industry of the owners and the report of the Tariff Board was at last published by the end of 1926. This recommendation of the Tariff Board and that rotten idea in the heads of the owners proved harmful to the working class and the strike of 1928 had to be declared to remove it. Before proceeding further (I shall refer to the following):— When the Tariff Board was sitting, I sent a letter to it on behalf of our Girni Kamgar Mahamandal. I referred in my letter to the grievances of the working class and the oppression and the force practised on us by the owners and expressed the hope that the Board would pay its attention to the condition of the workers and allow them also to place their side before it. As soon as this letter was sent to the Board it called us to place the side of us workers before it. At that time I represented the side of the workers on behalf of the Girni Kamgar Mahamandal and showed how severe was the oppression of the owners on us workers. As a part of that oppression I pointed out how heavily the owners fined the worker class and to what a terrible condition the workers were reduced on account of those oppressive fines and also that the fines were not insignificant but so heavy that our wages earned after two months' work were not even sufficient to cover the fines imposed by the owners. I told the Board: "If you can do something in regard to these heavy fines you please do so." That time the Committee asked me:

"What is the extent of those fines to which you refer?" I explained to the Board that time-nay I actually placed before the Board offenders of the owners who had been fined by the owners thus:- Workers who earned 20 to 25 rupees were fined 30 to 35 rupees. That is they were forced to take cloth worth that amount. At that time the owners gave wages to the workers after making them work for two months. Having thus worked for two months under such circumstances, the wages for both the months were confiscated by way of fine and on the pay the worker used to get in place of his wages a paper signed by the manager or the Weaving Master stating that he had been fined so many rupees. At this time the worker received a death-blow on getting the slip of fine in his hand and wandered about in the open street crying and bawling like a lunatic. At home his wife and children remained waiting for their time of death on account of starvation and they permanently bade goodbye to this oppressive world. The merchants and the Marwaris whose debt he had incurred for two months, sat in front of his door saying: "Give us money, otherwise we shall kill you." Not only that but they actually beat the workers. I brought this state of things to the notice of the Tariff Board with proof. From that time, either as a result of the recommendations of the Tariff Board or due to some other cause the terrible oppression of fines on us ceased. It cannot be said that fines ceased altogether but this terrible system of fines however came to an end. Whenever such committees are appointed we always congratulate them if they settle questions of the welfare of us workers. After stating this much I now refer to the new oppression by the owners. That is how the owners paid no attention to the other recommendations made by the Tariff Board and introduced the system of two sides and three looms with the only idea of reducing the wages of the workers. Ninety to hundred years must have at least elapsed since the mill-industry was started in Bombay. But an oppressive system of this sort had never been introduced.

[RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE TARIFF BOARD AND THE MACHINATIONS OF THE OWNERS

Taking advantage of the recommendation of the Tariff Board of the year 1926, Mr. Sassoon, a mill-owner of Bombay, introduced in July 1927 the system of three looms and two sides in two of his mills, Apollo and Manchester. As the workers in both the Mills could not at that time cope with the double work according to the (new) system, they at once went on strike. Then the Girni Kamagar Mahamandal took up the strike of both the Mills and communicated to the owners after thoroughly studying the new system that they should stop this their new

system as it was impossible to carry it on in the Bombay mills. But a satisfactory reply was neither received from the owners nor were they ready to make a compromise in regard to the workers' strike. Under these circumstances the strike of those two mills continued for nearly one and three quarters of a month and in the end the owners opened negotiations with the Mandal. At that time I, on behalf of the workers, brought to the notice of the owners: "You are seeking to introduce this new scheme in India and when introducing it you point to the examples of Lancashire and Japan (but) at the same time where is there the mechanical knowledge which Lancashire and Japan have got? If you want to introduce that scheme, you should first effect improvement in your machines (Mechanical art) and then start this your experiment. For I at least am opposed to the introduction of new machinery for improvement of work. But how can the experiment of this new scheme be successful if you begin it on this old and worthless machinery? Similarly you should begin to use superior cotton as is used in Lancashire and Japan. You should first effect these improvements and then introduce this scheme." Being actually a worker, not an ordinary one but one who had made thorough study of the mechanism of the mills for twenty to twenty-two years and one who had also seen improved machinery, I pointed out to the owners their mistakes and showed them how their experiment was impracticable, not by mere words but by actually doing the work in their presence. And they saw how it became impossible to work (according to the new scheme). And thereafter the owners also realized their foolishness. And when the owner said that he would stop the system, the men broke the strike and went to work. One or two months after the men had gone on work, that is in January 1928, the same owner, that is, Sassoon, reintroduced the system which was once stopped, in his nine or ten mills. And the men in the nine or ten mills that is all the 22000 men in the Sassoon Mills, went on strike. The Mahamandal again took that strike also in its hands and started correspondence with the owners. But the owner did not even send reply to the letters sent (by the Mahamandal). On trying the experiment of correspondence for fifteen to twenty days and on seeing that the owner paid no attention to it the question arose what should be done next. Just at this time the owner posted notices on the mill-doors that there was no demand for his goods and a large quantity of them was lying unsold in the mills and therefore he was going to close his mills and that if any worker desired to work he should work according to his new system so that he would start his mills. Notices of this sort were posted on the doors of every mill over the Managers' signature. At that time the question stood before us workers

what to eat if we sat at home and how to cope with the work according to this new system if we went to work. The strike continued for two to two and a half months under such circumstances. Just as the strike began to get prolonged a difficult question came forward in the same proportion before the Mahamandal. The difficult problem before the Mahamandal was whether all the mills in Bombay should be called out on strike in order to stop this oppressive system. For a hot discussion took place in the Executive Committee of the Mahamandal whether one lakh and twenty-five thousand men should be called on strike in order to stop the oppression on twenty to twenty-two thousand workers and to help them in their struggle. After that discussion it was settled that one lakh and twenty-five thousand persons in other mills should not be called out on strike for the sake of twenty to twenty two thousand men in the Sassoon (mills); but that the strike of those men alone who had gone on strike should be carried on with great determination till that owner stopped that oppressive system and that the remaining one lakh men should give monetary help to the strikers. Deciding thus, the Mahamandal conducted the strike of the Sassoon (Mills) and another resolution was passed by the Mandal that Mr. Alwe should discontinue his work in the mill and take up the work of the strike in his hands. According to that resolution, I left my work and took in hand this work of the strike and conducted the strike for two to two and a half months. I used to tell the men in other mills that they should only help the strike but should not declare a general strike. And I circulated among the workers those opinions of mine by issuing handbills. I advised the men that the worker in whose wages and work no change had been made should not participate in the strike, but those whose wages had been cut down by the owners or whose owners had introduced this new scheme should alone go on strike if they liked, in order to put a stop to that scheme or to get their wages (restored), but those in whose wages no change had been made or those to whom that oppressive scheme had not been made applicable should not resort to a strike. But our very shrewd owners took advantage of that goodness of mine and began to cut down the wages of the workers in the different mills. The men in those mills in which the workers' wages were cut down, went on strike. But I advised the strikers not to go to the doors of other mills and create confusion and not to compel them (men in other mills) to join the strike. I worked in order that one worker might not join another in the matter of the strike and that act of mine was not intended to cause harm to the workers but owing to my being a worker and as I had experience of previous strikes the thoughts stood day and night before my eyes: "If we workers go today on strike how long can we maintain it before these obstinate owners, and what

will we gain if after declaring a strike we do not maintain it till our demands are granted, and if after proclaiming a strike we workers are defeated, these oppressive owners will again practise more oppression on us and what will be the condition of us workers when ten times the present oppression shall be practised on us." I was therefore against a general strike. Vide D 439 (20), D 439 (30), D 439 (32), D 439 (33), D 439 (35), D 439 (36), D 439 (37), D 715 (1-13). But my eyes opened when the oppression of the workers by the owners reached its climax and when the question arose of the wages of about sixty thousand workers being cut down by the owners. I tried my best to settle the question by compromise or discussion without declaring a general strike, but those efforts of mine proved altogether ineffective. I made efforts day and night to the utmost of my power for three months, to avoid a general strike. You will know this from the handbills against a general strike issued by me. From this account you will see how in spite of this state of things the owners caused the strike. And the workers on their part raised a row against me and began to accuse me saying:—"You cause harm to us workers, that is, you advise us not to declare a general strike and you work on behalf of the owners." At that time, however, all the workers became convinced that the owners would not grant their demands by compromise and discussion and that there was no other alternative for all the workers except to unite and declare a general strike of the mills in Bombay.

(Incomplete)

Sd, K. S. A.

Sd/-R. L. Yorke

24- 8. 31.

Alwe (continued)

We had to adopt this final remedy that time because no other alternative was left to meet the condition of the workers. I made correspondence on behalf of the Mandal with the Mill-owners' Association before calling this mill-strike. But I received no reply to it. Then I gave one month's notice to the Mill-owners' Association, on behalf of the mill-workers. It was like this: "If you will not consider about the question of the cut in the wages of us workers and about this new Standardization Scheme and do not stop it, we all the mill-workers shall have to declare a general mill-strike to keep our wages intact and to get this new oppressive Scheme stopped. And if you have to suggest anything in this matter or to open conversations with the Mandal you should send a reply regarding this question within one month from (the date) of this notice." Thereafter the Girmi Kamgar Mahamandal received from the owners' Association a letter full of arrogance and pride.

The secretary of the Mill-owners' Association wrote in it: "We do not desire to consider the three questions viz. that of the new Scheme introduced by us, the men that we have reduced and the rates given to the workers which you say have been cut down by us." After the reply to this notice was received by us from the owners, that letter of the owners was discussed before the executive committee of the Mahamandal and it was unanimously resolved that there was no other alternative but the declaration of a general strike. Vide D 420 page 12. These strikes declared by us workers were not at all declared to break up the Emperor's *Raj* and these strikes were not also political. Such strikes are declared in the last resort after all other remedies of the workers have been tried to preserve their wages intact. What other means is there, with the help of which we can change our circumstances? Though this strike of April 1928 was called by the Girni Kamgar Mahamandal, still other institutions of the mill-workers also had joined it. Both Mr. N.M. Joshi's Textile Labour Union and Mr. Jhabwala's Mill Workers' Union had been participating and working in the strike. Then a Joint-Strike Committee was formed of those three institutions, that is, the Girni Kamgar Mahamandal, the Textile Labour Union and the Mill-Workers' Union to conduct the strike. And thirty persons were elected on that Strike Committee. Out of these thirty, twenty were workers and 10 non-worker outsiders. Messrs. Joshi, Jinwala, Asavle, Sayad Munavar and Parulekar were the five non-worker representatives on behalf of the Textile Labour Union, similarly Mr. Jhabwala, Nimbkar, Dange, Bradley and Mirajkar were the five non-worker representatives on behalf of the Mill-workers' Union and the Girni Kamgar Mahamandal. The work of the strike was conducted by the committee of these thirty persons. But after this Strike Committee had been formed, the owners introduced a new device that they would confer in the matter of the strike only with a registered Union. The Girni Kamgar Mahamandal was not a registered Union at that time. The Textile Labour Union was a registered Union. But Mr. Joshi thought that it would be of no use for the representatives of his Union to confer with the owners as there was no backing of the workers behind his Textile Labour Union and he asked us why we did not get our Girni Kamgar Union registered. Thereafter, there was discussion in the Executive Committee of the Maha Mandal about such things as whether it was necessary to register the Maha Mandal immediately, and it was decided to register the Mandal as early as necessary (thinking) why the Maha Mandal also should not be registered if the owners be prepared to confer with a Registered Union alone and if the strike was likely to end early by conferring with the owners in the matter of the strike. And I applied to the Labour Office that the mandal should be registered and went there

myself. But what (did I find) there? The owners had taken in hand Mayekar who had been driven from the Secretaryship of the Mahamandal and he was asked (by them) to get the mandal registered. It was then necessary for Mr. Mayekar to secure the signatures of seven workers in order to register the Union, but it was difficult for him to get even those. For, up till now, from the year 1923 to the year 1928, Mr. Mayekar had caused all confusion in the affairs of the G. K. Mahamandal. He had misappropriated the money of the Union to such an extent that it had become very dangerous to keep a man like him in the workers' union. Besides this, as Mayekar was the Secretary of the union, he did not place before the owners in the way he ought to have done, the correspondence of the Mandal and the complaints of the workers, but coming to an understanding with the owners through the hope of (getting) money, he had totally ruined the institution of the workers for his own selfish ends. Similarly three schools, that is night schools for the workers and day schools for the workers' children, were conducted on behalf of the G. K. Mahamandal. The Mandal used to pay the teachers of these schools. But as Mayekar was the Secretary (of the Mahamandal) he began to pocket the pay of the teachers. Similarly a dispensary had been opened on behalf of the Mahamandal to provide medicine to the workers in case of illness. And Mayekar took money from the Mandal for the medicines but did not pay the same to the doctor. Under such circumstances because Mayekar had everywhere created confusion in the affairs of the Mandal and after all the acts of his came to light with proof the Executive Committee of the Mandal placed before the men the all-round dishonest management of Mayekar and unanimously turned him out of the Mandal. Vide D 420 page 11. I do not wish to take more time of the Court by giving more instances of the management of Mayekar, who was a person like this. My only object in referring to Mayekar is that I have been charged in the Lower Court of quarrelling with Mayekar and bringing about a strike by making a common cause with other men and the Court had shown Mayekar to be a good gentleman. I have, therefore, given one or two instances about the goodness of Mayekar. The object of whatever work I had been doing up-till-now was that the economic condition of us workers may improve. And I have been making efforts up-till-now for its improvement. If the workers and the owners become of one mind, neither "trade" nor "Union" will be required in the world and if they begin to take care about the comforts of one another neither strike nor organisation will be required. But how is that to happen? The owner is day and night thinking about one thing only. That thought is that the servant must be low paid. When doing his (owner's) work the servant might do whatever he likes for his belly but should serve him on

low wages. The owner does not even think that the worker is a human being. The owner never looks to these circumstances of that servant that he should get wages sufficient for his livelihood or that he requires a house to live in or that he requires a house to live in or that he requires medical help if he falls ill. (The owner thinks) that the worker may live where he likes and may starve if he cannot maintain himself on low wages (and) may die if he falls ill, but that he should do the owner's work day and night on low wages. (The owner thinks) that it is not his business to see what the condition of the worker is. The owner is only thinking how he can derive more profit in his business, how his one crore of rupees shall amount to two crores. It is with these thoughts in mind that the owner acts. The workers and the owners have because of this become the enemies of one another today all over the world. Now several wise men say that if the worker begins to behave affectionately with the owner, the owner will also behave affectionately with him. But things are quite the reverse of what these wise men say. For the servant honestly does the work of his master, he makes efforts day and night in order that his master's business may not suffer loss, he works strenuously, he quietly bears the oppression of his master even if the master gives him kicks and blows, he himself bears any amount of hardships to please his master, going without food or ignoring his own happiness and convenience he strives for as much profit as his master can get and in the end he spends all his life for the sake of his master. But what benefit does that servant get from that owner even after doing this? He is driven from his work and reduced to starvation owing to some minor cause. Then, where these things are going on today how can they feel affection for one another? How can respect be created in their minds about one another? He must be at least a fool who advises that they should behave affectionately when the position is that one has to die and the other kills him. The servant is ready to behave affectionately with the owner night and day. But does the owner want the affection of the servant? He does not want the worker's affection but his blood. Where such is the state of things today this question of affection does not at all arise. And if the owner had desired to behave affectionately with the worker he would necessarily have paid attention to the condition of the worker, like this:—"Are the wages that we pay to this worker adequate for his maintenance or is the place where he lives, fit for human habitation? Besides, is it proper from the human point of view to make him work for the hours for which we make him work? Or if his health is affected and he falls ill because of our making him work excessively, have we made arrangements for his illness? Similarly if while working on a machine, he dies by an accident or his hand or foot is cut off, ought not he or his

wife and children to get maintenance? Or, taking into consideration that he is a human being, is it not necessary to grant him leave on account of his monetary difficulty or for some function?" How can the workers feel affection for the owner who does not even treat them as human beings in ordinary matters? Such oppression is being practised to day by the rich on the workers, but they (these oppressions) simply become them today in this Raj. Because even though the rich behave thoughtlessly today, they have got honour in this world. Even if they tell lies, there is no one to charge them with having told lies. Even if they act unjustly, there are today people at their back who say that they have acted only with justice. The whole of law is on their side. Where such is the condition, it is not possible to get justice in such a Raj of the rich, however straightforward and just the side of the servant or the labourer be. Because if more money—"more," that is adequate for maintenance—is demanded while doing the work of the owner, he is sure to be regarded as a criminal. If he leaves the service of the owner, because of failure to get adequate food, in spite of working for twelve to fourteen hours, or because of inability to bear the oppression of the owners, he is sure to be charged with having gone on strike and an attempt is made to entangle him in such a case of conspiracy. Such is the condition today of us workers in the world. I have already said that the work I had been doing up-till-now was being done only with the object of bringing about a change in the condition of us workers. My connection with this workers' movement is not new. I have been participating in the Bombay mill-workers' movement for the last ten years. That is I am connected with the workers' movement from its infancy. I can tell from my own experience that the condition of us workers ten years back was much worse than (our) present condition. Workers had silently to put up with inhuman things like beating, bribery, unnecessary fines etc. And these wicked things were going on in the Bombay mills in broad daylight. This just Govt. never came forward to protect us from them. At that time we workers learnt the art of protecting ourselves on the strength of union by starting Unions. I can say from my own experience that these inhuman practices have ceased on account of the strength of the workers organization during the last ten years. Ten years ago these mill-owners were treating us exactly like cattle. But a slight change has taken place in our condition today on the strength of our organization. And the change is that we are today being treated as slaves. The owners adopt the tricks of increasing the hours of our work, cutting down our wages, foisting the work of two men on one etc. in order to fill the bag of their profit. The humanity of us workers is completely trampled under

foot (Lit. dashed down a precipice) under the grand name of re-trenchment (or) standardization, and fighting against this is merely fighting for our existence. And we the working class who are ignorant and uneducated are able to carry on this struggle merely on the strength of organization, that is of the Trade Union movement. I was working in a movement of this nature which was going on for mere rights of humanity. This movement is considered constitutional and lawful in all reformed nations. I do not, therefore, at all understand why in this our country alone workers working in a lawful movement should be gagged by being charged of conspiring against the Emperor.

I have to tell here briefly what I mean by saying so long that the economic condition of us workers should improve. Every worker should have to work for less hours, he should get wages adequate to enable him to exist in this world as a human being, oppressions like fines must cease, provision for medicine must be made if he falls ill while working, house rent for the workers should be fixed in proportion to their wages, the system of receiving bribes must cease full pay leave for one month must be granted, a worker must not be dismissed from work unless a very serious offence has been committed by him, so also his wages for the days he has worked must on no account be forfeited, beating of workers must cease, they should not be abused, they must get old age pension if a man is to be dismissed from work he must be given one month's wages in advance, women workers ought not to be ill-treated, they must get full pay leave for delivery, similarly women with children must get the concession of going out of the mill to suckle their children, the owner of the mill in which a worker works must give him cloth at cheap rates, similarly over-time allowance must be paid if work for extra hours is taken from the workers, workers must get posts of officers according to their qualifications in those mills in which they are working, Europeans or Parsees from outside should not be appointed to posts of authority, a worker must get compensation if his hand or foot gets cut in a machine by accident, the owners must make arrangements for the education of the workers, the owners must recognize the workers' Unions, the Satanic system that the owners entertain at present in their head that the workers are their slaves, that they should take the wages which the owners would pay them, that they should work for as many hours as the owners would ask them and that the workers should go away from work when they would dismiss them, is totally destructive to the rights of humanity and must cease. The idea that the workers are their slaves, which exists in the heads of the owners must disappear. I had been doing Trade Union work up till now in a constitutional manner in order to remove this

oppressive system and to get back the rights of the workers.

Now I think I should go back a little and describe how the Mahamandal came to an end and how the G. K. Union was born. I have already said that when I went to the Labour Office to register the (Maha) Mandal, I was told by Mr. Jennings, the Director of the Labour Department, and by Mr. Meherban that Mayekar had registered a Union entitled (the G. K. Maha) "Mandal". At that time I said to Mr. Meherban: "I am surprised how you gave him the registration certificate of the Mandal when Mayekar had been dismissed from secretaryship by the members (Lit Men) and when the notice of his dismissal had been given to your Labour Office." Vide P. 1463. (A resolution) was passed by the Executive Committee of the G. K. Mahamandal that the G. K. Mahamandal should take legal steps, that is, should file a suit in a law court, against the Director of the Labour Office for surreptitiously granting the certificate about the Mahamandal as conducted from 1923 to 1928 to Mayekar even though the Labour Office knew that Mayekar had been turned out from the Mandal. And by way of instituting a case, a notice through a pleader was also served on the Director of the Labour Office. The resolution regarding it will be found in D. 420 page 16. When this took place and when the owners on the other hand were not ready to confer with a non-registered Union, the Mahamandal was confronted with the question what to do next under such circumstances and it was decided to establish a Union under some new name. Then a discussion took place in the Executive Committee of the Mahamandal about the name to be given to it and was resolved that the Union should be registered under the name Bombay Girni Kamgar Union. Vide D 420 page 16. And that Union was registered in April 1928. D 431 is the registration certificate. As Mayekar who was driven away from the Mahamandal had stolen away some papers of the Mahamandal, he represented himself to be the representative of the Mandal and used to go to the owners and the Governor on behalf of the Mandal to bring about a compromise in the matter of the strike. At that time when he, the Governor, had come to Bombay in order to have a talk in the matter of the strike, I had informed him that Mayekar was neither the representative of workers nor also an office-bearer of the G. K. Mahamandal. And I am tendering the reply sent by him, D 716.

Now I leave here the question of the Mahamandal and turn to the G. K. Union. But before that I shall tell afterwards when I became acquainted with my co-worker friends, from what time I began to cooperate with them and in what matter that cooperation of mine existed. But I am tendering a proof regarding the time when I met them. I became acquainted with them that is Nimbkar,

Bradley etc., on 6-4-1928. Vide D 717. Now I think I should say here how I became acquainted with these. I was acquainted with Mr. Joglekar from the year 1926. For, he was the secretary of the Bombay Provincial Congress Committee in the year 1926 and I was a member of the B.P. Congress Committee. Evidently I knew him as a Swarajist as such. The Bombay Provincial Congress Committee had appointed a Labour Committee in the year 1926 and Mr. Joglekar was a member of that Labour Committee. Therefore he used to come among us workers and delivered lectures regarding the importance of the workers' organization. I know Mr. Joglekar from that time. And several times we came together in the worker's movement. Then I began to know Mr. Nimbkar in the year 1927 because he was that year the secretary of the Bombay Provincial Congress Committee and I was also a member of the Provincial Congress Committee. I only knew him as the secretary of the Bombay Provincial Congress Committee. Then I again knew him as the secretary of the Municipal (workers') Union. But up to that time however that is up to April 1928, he and I had never worked together except in the Congress. Then I saw Mr. Mirajkar in April 1928, till that time I did not know him. I became acquainted with him as the secretary of the Dock-Workers' Union. Then I also became acquainted with Mr. Bradley in April 1928 in this manner:—Mr. Joglekar brought Mr. Bradley with himself while a meeting of us workers was going on and I became acquainted with him in that meeting. And while introducing Mr. Bradley to me, Mr. Joglekar told me that he was a British Trade Union leader. Then I became acquainted with Mr. Dange also in April 1928 and that acquaintance was as the secretary of the Tramwaymen's Union. Now I became acquainted with Mr. Ghate also in April 1928, and that was as the vice president of the Municipal (Workers') Union. I know Mr. Jhabwala from 1920-21. After these acquaintances were formed, these men used to come (to us) everyday during the strike of the mill-workers. Our acquaintance therefore ripened. And the election of the newly registered Girni Kamgar Union took place in May 1928. The workers elected me as President at the time of the election of the G. K. Union. Similarly Mr. Dange was elected as the General Secretary of the G.K. Union, Mr. Jhabwala was elected Vice-President. Mr. Nimbkar, Bradley and Tamhankar, in all four (including Jhabwala) were elected Vice-Presidents and Messrs. B. T. Alwe and Ghate were elected as treasurers. Messrs. Satam and Tavde were both elected secretaries. Thereafter the election of the Executive Committee took place. The G. K. Union was started under such circumstances and the work of the strike was conducted through it.

The strike of 1928 lasted for about 5½ months and in the end,

after negotiations through the joint-strike-committee, this big strike ended on the condition of maintaining the same rates, the same wages, the same number of men as there were in March 1927. The workers carried on this strike of 1928 so peacefully that it was worth commendation all over the world. You can find an instance in D 417 of how in order to break the workers' strike the Police used to resort to firing on the workers on behalf of the owners. Though the Police and the owners made so many attacks on the workers still strenuous attempts were made to preserve peacefulness. I am greatly surprised at the terrible bogey raised out of this strike and the political form given to it. Our workers' strike was not at all a political strike and though it is called a 'general' strike it was not 'general' in the sense of being a strike of all the workers in Bombay. It was the strike of the Bombay mill-workers alone. This strike was not at all intended to put the British Govt. in difficulty or to subvert its power. I do not at all understand why, in spite of this, the strike is given such a terrible political form. Supposing that that strike was of a political character, a political demand ought to have as a matter of fact, been brought forward when the compromise took place. Whereas this demand does not come forward or whereas the strike has not the least connection with political questions how then is the strike and the subversion of the Emperor's *Raj* to be reconciled ?

(To be continued).

Sd. K. S. A.

Sd. R. L. Yorke.

25.8.31.

Alwe (continued)

If I begin to tell the history of the six months' strike of April 1928, there will be an altogether new strike history in the world, therefore I will tell about the strike briefly, in a sentence or two. This strike was brought about by the mill-owners. Those mill-owners knew that the new standardization scheme they intended to introduce was not practicable and that it was not also possible for the workers to work according to that scheme. Even in spite of knowing this, the owners had deliberately brought about the strike. And the mill-owners alone know what their object was in bringing about this strike. But what I have to tell here is only this. What was the condition of the workers during this six months' strike brought about by the owners, how many persons died crying for food—several poisoned themselves, while several hanged themselves. There was none to give (anything) or to help during the strike time. If the worker was to go to work, it was not possible for him to cope with the work. In such circumstances

the workers left their wives and children and ran away wherever they liked, while several shutting in their wives and children in their rooms and being unable to bear the sight of their starvation, locked the doors from the outside and went away in any direction they liked. But no worker thought of going to work on the new scheme introduced by the owners, in order to save his life which was threatened (lit. going). You yourself will see what this means. I at least have to say only this much that it is easy for you to understand the nature of this scheme introduced by the owners, (seeing) that the worker class prefers death to working according to the new scheme of the owners. So, you will easily understand who brought about the strike and who prolonged it. Now the Prosecution has charged me in the lower court with having brought about the strike. My reply to this (charge) is only this. Had even thousands of Alwes like me come there, the strike would not have been prolonged for so many days by their advice (to prolong it) and however truthful my advice had been, the workers would not have accepted it, while starving without food and they would have gone to work breaking the strike. But the condition as regards the strike was not as alleged by the Prosecution, but the fact was that the strike lasted for six months and the men broke up the strike and went to work as soon as the owners said that they would stop the scheme. If anybody be guilty of bringing about the strike and prolonging it, it is the mill-owners. But those very mill-owners are today enjoying the air on Malabar Hill and are enjoying luxury. And a worker like me is for these two and a half years suffering in jail (for) the sin of those owners and (my) wife and children are dying at home without food. Such is the justice of truth in this world at present.

When the workers began to die of hunger in this strike we made efforts to get help from the people. I submit a handbill D 718 to show the same.

Now I shall leave the account of the strike here and briefly state the reasons why educated outsiders had to be taken in the workers' Union. I have alerdy said that it was a rule of our former Mahamandal that these outsiders should not be taken in the Unions of us workers. But I give the reasons why educated outsiders had to be taken by changing that rule. First reason:— As there was no one among us workers who could read and write English, difficulty was felt in carrying on the work of the Union. Second reason:—The correspondence and the conversation with the owners had to be carried on in English, replies had to be given to false accounts in English newspapers and it was quite necessary to place before the public what was the real condition of the workers, what the owners said and what the workers demanded,

And all these things were required to be done in English. Third reason:—The new standardization scheme prepared by the owners was in English. What the scheme was had to be explained to the workers in their own language and it was necessary to explain it and this work was not likely to be done by employing some English knowing clerk. Because trade unionists only, who knew what the workers' Trade Union movement is, were required. And when the above difficulties were felt, the rule was changed and outsider Trade Unionists had to be taken in as advisers. And my cooperation with them was based on the information that these persons were Trade Unionists. The number of such outsiders was only five or six on the managing committee of us workers. And these outsider representatives were taken as advisers. Now I shall state afterwards whatever I have to say about these outsiders.

RED FLAG

Now it is necessary for me to explain a little regarding the Bombay G. K. Union and that red flag of it. For, as I was the President of that Union I think it necessary to give explanation about the flag. Another reason also is that the prosecution has on the support of that red flag brought curious accusations against the workers' Union, similarly on seeing the red flag of the Union the people opposed to the workers' movement have made false statements about it and have attacked it. On seeing the red flag of the Union some said that it was a Union of Communists while some said that it was a Union based on the principles of Moscow because its flag was red. Some one calls it a militant Union while others go on calling it what they like. And the people began to blame the workers' Union as they pleased as they went on speculating on seeing the red flag of the Union. But none knows the real facts why the red flag had to be adopted for that Union, and as speculations about the red flag came into currency after I was arrested, it became impossible for me to give an explanation regarding it. And as no one knows the real account of why the red flag had to be chosen (for that Union) and why it was adopted, great calamities have today fallen on that G.K. Union and it is today on the point of death. Similarly on the support of the red flag of the Union the Communists have totally monopolized the workers' movement. The Bombay G. K. Union is being today torn to pieces just like the corpse of a dead animal. Someone drags it towards the Third International while someone else drags it towards the Second International. Someone calls it a Union founded on Lenin's principles while someone else says that it is based on the principles of Karl Marx. Someone says that the principles of that Union are such, while someone else say that they are

not like that but as said by him. Someone calls it a militant Union while someone else says that it is not militant but aggressive. In this manner, taking the support of that red flag, the Bombay G. K. Union has been totally shattered to pieces today on account of the trouble of the red flag. And on account of that red flag the work of the organization of workers and the work regarding their economic condition and the oppression of the owners on the workers has remained aside, and that Union and similarly the mill-workers have today been confronted by a great calamity and the work of the organization of workers has been ruined. And it can be clear if the condition of the mill-workers today and the history of the G. K. Union is seen. Now the only thing I have to say here is that when the Bombay G.K. Union was born, it had not got that red flag. It was born as the Bombay G. K. Union in May 1928. And it was five months after that, that is, in October that the Union was marked with a red flag. Vide P 958, a resolution of the Managing Committee dated 16-10-28. Now why was it necessary to adopt this mark of the red flag? The workers won the big 6 months strike of 1928. Then in that strike the workers had come to know what was meant by workers' organization, how much that organization was necessary for them and (how) they could on the strength of unity turn back the attacks of the owners on them; and the men began to become the members of the Union in large numbers. At that time there were the following four unions among us mill-workers:— (1) The Textile Labour Union of Mr. N. M. Joshi, (2) The Mill Workers' Union of Mr. Jhabwala, (3) The Bombay Girni Kamagar Union of Mr. Alwe, and (4) The Girni Kamagar Mahamandal of Mr. Mayekar. Really speaking, if there was any real Union of the workers it was the Bombay G.K. Union which was conducted by the workers. There were eighty persons on the Managing Committee of that Bombay G.K. Union, all of whom were workers and there were five or six outsiders on the committee as advisers. But the whole management of the Union was in the hands of the workers alone and was conducted according to their opinion in this manner. If there be any complaint in any mill, it was dealt with through the mill-committee of that mill. There were in this manner seventy five mill Committees for seventy-five mills and those mill Committees had sent one representative each on the Managing Committee (of the Union). Thus this Managing Committee was formed of eighty persons. Now the mill committee of each mill contained ten to twelve representatives. Now the total of the representatives on those mill committees and of the Executive Committee of the Union comes to 750 and all of them were mill-workers. This information will show you how ridiculous is the dirty charge made against the Union by the Prosecution, that the Union was an

institution conducted under the control of the Workers' and the Peasants' Party, and that it was dominated by the W. & P. Party. Now out of these 750 representatives of the G. K. Union, not one was a member of the Workers' and Peasants' Party and none was a Communist. Now leaving aside this question I turn to the red flag. I have already said that when there came to be these four Unions among the mill-workers, necessity (Lit. difficulty) was felt that our Union should have some work in order that the members of the Union should know which was the institution conducted by us workers, and the reason why this necessity was felt was that as there were four unions among the mill-workers, the managers of other Unions began to act fraudulently towards the members of the G. K. Union in this manner. They began to take for their (union) fraudulently from the men the subscriptions for the G. K. Union saying "This Union here is yours." At that time great agitation arose among the mill workers. The offices of Mr. Joshi's Union were opened wherever there were the offices of the Bombay G. K. Union. The names of both the Unions were the same in Marathi. Now the word Bombay preceded the name of our Union while it followed that of Mr. Joshi's Union. But as this difference could not be properly grasped by the workers, the men began to be misled and as several workers could not read and write, they became perplexed. After that, this complaint of the members was placed before the Managing Committee of the Bombay G. K. Union and a discussion took place in the Managing Committee of the G. K. Union about having a distinctive mark (Lit for being recognized) for the Union which could be recognized even by those who could not read and write, because men of other unions misled the men and deceitfully received money intended for our Union, and it was resolved to adopt some distinctive mark for the Union, and after a discussion as to what that mark should be, it was decided to adopt the red flag as the mark for the G. K. Union, and that the red flag should be hoisted on the outside of every office that is (every) branch of the Union and that it should be made known to the people that the office with the red flag should be known as the Union conducted by us workers. The discussion that took place in the Managing Committee at the time of adopting that mark of the red flag was as follows:-, This red colour does not fade as a result of the sun's heat or of any other cause. It always remains uniformly bright. It was selected only on account of this and the mark of the red flag was made. The red flag was neither hoisted as the sign of Moscow or the mark of the Third International. At least no discussion of that kind took place there in the Managing Committee. It was a mark for mere recognition. Such is the true story of this red flag. From that time that is from October 1928 the men began to recognize (the G. K. Union) as the

Red Flag Union and it began to be known by that name. Such was this Union of the workers and I was elected as President of that Union by the men because I was also a workman. And the membership of that Union was 80,000. None of those workers was a Communist and we did not know whether the outsiders taken in our workers' Union were Communists or not. Now some men think that that Union could do so much work because there were four or five Communists in it. My reply to it is this that all of us were at that time convinced from the information we had about the advisers that they were Trade Unionists. Now if their present acts had been foreseen (Lit. seen) and if the workers or myself had been aware of them before my arrest, it is doubtful whether they could have become the office-bearers of that workers' Union. I at least think that if their present system of work is taken into consideration, what of the workers' Union, it would have been difficult for them even to remain in that Union even for one day. Another thing I hear is that in the opinion of some men those who were taken as advisers were Communists and that the membership of this Union increased so much on account of them alone. My only reply to this is that if someone says so he will be mistaken, and if any importance is to be given to what he says the number which would have fallen to the share of the Communists would have been that left after erasing the first figure from the membership of 80,000. And if any one wants to see the truth of what I say he will see it in today's Bombay G. K. Union. Now you can verify from P. 791 (and) P 792 (1) what I have said about there being 75 workers on the Managing Committee of the Union. For further information about the members of the Managing Committee vide D 440 (pages 7, 9, 10, 11, 20, 21, 22, 29, 31 and 32). From this information of mine (it will be seen that) the leadership of the G. K. Union was entirely in the hands of the workers.

I have already said why these men had to be taken into the Union. Another reason also why they were elected on the G. K. Union was that we believed to be true the fellow-feeling which they exhibited towards the workers when I became acquainted with them in the strike of 1928 and their representation at that time that they were pure Trade Unionists and they were therefore elected unopposed at the time of the election of the G.K. Union. Therefore I also naturally thought that these were good gentlemen, highly educated and clever, and we did not at all think that the things they told us would differ from their actions. And I cooperated with them because we had at first received information that they were at that time Trade Union workers and because from the fellow-feeling towards the workers of which they made a show, I was inclined to think that they were good gentlemen and great patriots and that we poor

men would benefit by associating with them. At the time of the strike these men placed before the public the condition of us workers, they expressed solicitude in their (of the workers) own language, and described their economic difficulties. They also said: "How bad are the houses of the workers, how high is the rent and how the locality is full of sickness. And see (if) the Bombay Municipality is doing anything for you? For, today there are all rich men in the Bombay Municipality and the Municipality is in their hands. And the cause of that being so is that you elect rich men when the Municipal election takes place, this is your mistake. Therefore hereafter you must elect workers and those also like Alwe (to the Municipality) to effect a change in your condition. And so long as men like Alwe are not sent to the Municipality or the (Legislative) Council or the Legislative Assembly, the condition of you workers will not be changed in the least. We neither want to become your leaders nor to get Ministerships (Lit. honourables) nor to get ourselves elected to the Legislative Assembly, the (Legislative) Council, or the Municipality in your name. We tell this to you only with the intention that your condition may improve (Lit. be removed). It is also our work to show you the way and we are doing that work. Our only strong desire is that the sorrows of you poor people should disappear." Telling such things these people showed such a fellow-feeling that we workers and myself also thought that they were entirely selfless, benevolent, patriotic persons and, as it were, gods come down in human form for the uplift of the world. But I had not to remain in perplexity for many days after seeing what they said and what they did. Because at the time of the Municipal election, I came to understand how much truth there was in what they said and what they did. It was like this. Seven or eight months before the Municipal election, that is at the time of the strike, these very [gentlemen used to say that Alwe must be elected as the representative of the workers. Because, at that time no one among us mill-workers had any achievements to his credit excepting Mr. Alwe. Therefore their only game was: why not make our position strong if it can be made by taking Mr. Alwe's name. And that game was in the end brought to light in this manner. When the actual time for the Municipal election came, these benevolent, selfless persons, who used to say that Alwe alone must stand (for election), stood (for election) as workers' leaders through every ward. And showing the people what a tremendous work they had done during the strike told them to elect them. And Alwe was elected as Municipal Councillors only within the minute book of the Workers' and Peasants' Party. My only object in telling this is that when I saw this difference in what they said and in what they did, I thought that there was some ground for danger.

P. 1353, I have already said in the Lower Court that as I

was a peasant as well as a worker, I became a member of all organizations founded either in the name of the workers or the peasants solely in the belief that these organizations are intended for the purpose of improving (Lit. removing) the economic condition of the workers and peasants. The same thing happened in my becoming a member of the Workers' and Peasants' Party. I have no information, whether I was elected to the Executive Committee of that Party. I have signed P. 1353 which is the form of that Party and I became a member (of that party), but I had not got explained to myself what the aims and objects of the Workers' and Peasants' Party were and what its programme was. And I had no time for that purpose. I had got before me such a tremendous work of the Bombay G.K.U. that I did not get time for meals from 8 A.M. to 11 P. M. My sixteen hours were spent in (dealing with) the workers' complaints, in carrying on talks with the owners and in strikes caused by insignificant and minor things. Now that being the real state of things and as I was a worker and a peasant I was under the impression that this Workers' and Peasants' Party must be intended solely for the economic improvement of the workers and peasants and that its object must be to unite the workers and the peasants and to improve their condition. It was therefore that I became a member of that party. Really speaking I did not at all know before my arrest what the programme of the party was and I do not know it even now. I did not really take any prominent part on behalf of the Party in any of its programmes. Being a worker and a peasant myself, there is only one ideal before me today and that is only that of uniting the workers and the peasants by organizing institutions in the name of the workers and the peasants. It is still my impression that the ideal of this Workers' and Peasants' Party might be similar. It was my impression that these institutions of the workers and the peasants which are organized are not specially political institutions. And that impression of mine was correct to some extent. A similar institution named 'Shetakari-Unnati-Sahayak Mandal' (An association for promoting the uplift of the peasants) was inaugurated in the year 1926. And the programme of organizing cooperative societies and credit societies of the peasants and of uniting the peasants is being carried on by the Mandal today. My impression was that similar might be the programme of this (Party). Therefore I became a member. Really speaking the question before us ignorant and uneducated workers and peasants today is not a political question but is the question of livelihood. Because, even after twelve hours' work continuously, sufficient bread for the belly is not got even once (in a day). Then (Lit. and) how to get this bread? Thinking in the mind that the problems of our livelihood will be placed before the people only by legal methods by these institutions founded in the names of the

workers or the peasants, and that some redress might be possible through them, we become members of such organizations. But when such organizations come to birth their leadership lies in the hands of the educated class alone. Therefore only the conductors of the organization know with what object in mind the institution has been founded. But when the ideal or the objects of the organization are explained to us, we are told that the organization is intended solely to improve (Lit. to remove) our economic condition and to remove our difficulties and that we should become its members and through our ignorance we believe in this and immediately become members without further inquiry. It is true that on occasions advantage is taken of our ignorance and we are deceived. But unless we get actual experience as to whether we are being deceived or not, we cannot blame that man without cause. Just as the blind man has the support of the stick, similarly we uneducated people have to place reliance on the educated. So long as the man with the stick does not make the blind man fall in a ditch till then the blind man has not only got full confidence on the man with eyes but he also considers him to be his benevolent deity. Similarly we the uneducated consider these educated persons to be benevolent and keeping blind faith in them we form the impression that whatever they say is hundred per cent true and we also believe it.

(Incomplete).

Sd. K. S. A.

31-8-31.

Sd/- R. L. Yorks.

Alwe (continued).

And if anyone has taken the advantage of the ignorance of such blind men, it must be said that he has proved treacherous to those blind men. I have said already that I have no special knowledge of this Party. And as I had not taken any special part in the programmes of that party, I did not know properly how many persons there were in this Party and what was its programme, what work was done by the persons in the Party and what part I had taken in it. Because the programme of the Party—and it has been brought before the court—is in English, so I have not thoroughly understood it. Therefore I cannot give more information about the Party. But my name has been mentioned once or twice in the minute book of the Party, and it is being shown here that I had attended one meeting. It is necessary to give a little explanation about that.

See page 42 of P1344. I have been named as a candidate for Municipal election on behalf of the Party. Of course I did not know

of this. I was not even told (about that). I saw (it) when the document was cited against me after I was arrested and brought here. Then I was much surprised. I am not against standing for Municipal election and if I had got the desire to stand for Municipal election, I did not require the certificate of this wretched Party. The workers' Union of which I was the President had a membership of 80,000 and I could have stood and got easily elected on the certificate of that Union.

• See page 101 of the minute book (P. 1344) dated 23. 9. 28. Difference of opinion between Alwe and Nimbkar. I do not properly remember why this difference of opinion arose, but he and myself had differences of opinion from the point of view of (our) work.

Page 107 of P. 1344, dated 13.1.29. Communal dispute. I have said about my having attended a meeting of the Party, (but) I do not know whether there was a meeting of the Party on that day. But Mr. Ghate had told me that I should that day come at 1 P.M. in the office of their Workers' and Peasants' Party. Then according to his request I had gone there. Then there were sitting there Messrs. Ghate, Dange, Nimbkar, Joglekar, Bradley, Lalji Pendse, Kulkarni, Bhayyaji etc. After I went there, I was asked whether it was my intention to have communal quarrels in the workers' movement. When this question was asked, I was somewhat surprised. At that time, I told them only this much that there was no place for communal quarrel in the movement of us workers, that the workers were all one, that the workers' movement was for livelihood and not for communalism (Lit. Community) and that I was quite opposed to these communal quarrels. This was the only question asked me. Then after some time I left the place and even when I was there, I did not understand anything of the discussion in their Party as it was in English. I was a member of this Party but had not paid its subscription. Vide P. 1343.

P. 1348 (41) is the notice of a meeting. It bears my signature, but I was not present at it.

P. 1348 (50) is also a notice. The list includes my name, but I do not know why it was put in there.

P. 1373 (14) is (about) the Lenin Day meeting and it includes my name. I do not know when this Lenin Day was celebrated and I did not also attend that meeting but only the person who wrote the name can say why my name was included in the Lenin Day Meeting.

Here ends my work about the Workers' and Peasants' Party and the story of that Party.

I have already said that these educated men take some advantage of the ignorance of us ignorant workers and peasants. A proof of it can be had from P 953. This article is mine and there is below it the signature A. A. Alwe, President, Girni Kamgar Union, but it has been scored through and the words "Kamkari Shetkari Paksha" (Workers' and Peasants' Party) were written (in its place), why, only he who wrote (those words) can say. And they alone might be knowing what was their object in dragging me into the Party.

Now I wish to narrate before the Court another funny instance which happened while I was in jail. You can see how two letters with my forged signature on them were sent as from me while I was in jail. The man who was the jailor at that time has said in his deposition that Alwe wrote those letters P. 2284 P, P 2284(1) P. in his presence, but the handwriting expert (Lit. the person recognizing signatures by scientific method) has given it to be his opinion that the signature is not that of Alwe. Therefore the Court itself should consider what this mystery is. I can say only this much in this connection that somebody was certainly taking advantage of my ignorance.

Now (let us take) the meeting of 16.1.29, P 958, minute book of the Bombay G. K. Union. It is necessary for me to give an explanation as regards the fifth resolution in this meeting. As the prosecution has placed quite a wrong interpretation on this resolution, I have to tell the real circumstances. Though Mr. Bradley was a vice-president of the Bombay G. K. Union, he never attended the (meeting of the) Executive Committee of the Bombay G. K. Union excepting once or twice. He was however present only in the meeting of 16.1.29. He used specially to do the work of organisation of the G.I.P. Union. When he had gone to Bauria, the strike of the Bauria Mill was going on there. When he came into the meeting of the Managing Committee of the G. K. Union, he gave a description about the Bauria strike and the condition of the workers on strike. After hearing this his account, it was discussed what help it was possible to give to the Bauria Mill strikers on behalf of us workers. At that time I brought forward a resolution that the G. K. Union should give one thousand rupees as help in connection with the strike to the workers on strike. That (resolution) was passed and it was decided that (the amount) should be sent by two instalments of Rs. 500 each. We did not know who conducted the Bauria Mill strike or who was the President or the Secretary of the Union. It was therefore decided at that time that, (the amount) should be sent by the Secretary of the G. K. Union to the address of the Secretary of the Bauria Union and that inquiry

should be made as to who the Secretary was. The help which we give (is given because) we the workers in the whole world are one and we consider it our duty to help one another whenever the workers have occasion to fight against the owners. In 1926 a big strike of the labourers in British coal mines had taken place. I had sent as help to their strike Rs. 130/- on behalf of our G. K. Mahamandal. Similarly when a Mill-strike took place in Bombay, in the year 1925, the British workers had sent about rupees twenty to twenty-five thousand as help to that strike also. Similarly when a big strike took place in Bombay in the year 1928, help to the extent of Rs. 80,000/- was received from foreign workers even during that strike. My only object in telling this is that it is the custom of the world for the workers to help one another when the worker struggles against the owner about the question of livelihood. This help is not given with some improper object in mind. Why this first instalment of Rs. 500/- was sent to the name of Muzaffar can be explained only by him who sent it to his name. Because from what I have heard here, Radha Raman Mitra was the secretary of the Union and Kishorilal Ghosh its President, what can the object be then in sending the money to the name of Muzaffar ?

There was no kind of connection between the G.K. Union and the Worker's and Peasants' Party. Five or six members of the Workers' and Peasants' Party were in the G.K. Union. That is all. But the work of those two (institutions) was separate and the G.K. Union and the Workers' and Peasants' Party were distinct institutions. The G.K. Union had never joined any programme of the Workers' and the Peasants' Party. The charge, therefore, made by the Prosecution against the G.K. Union is absolutely false.

Workers and Peasants and the Indian Congress.

It is now about forty-five or forty six years since the Indian National Congress was started. If its demands from the first are examined, it will be seen that it is an institution brought into existence in order to carry on negotiations with the Govt. on behalf of India. It will be seen that among the first demands made on behalf of India, no demands were made for us the peasant and worker class. In the year 1906, the Congress made a demand about Swaraj and placed the goal of Swaraj before the nation. But the definition of what was Swaraj was not clearly placed before the people. The only thing that was said was that once Swaraj was established in India, the people of India will get everything. If the resolutions of the Congress thereafter are seen, those demands appear to have been made for

the higher persons that is for factory owners, zamindars and some (demands) only for the educated class. Therefore it did not appear that many Congressmen had the idea as to how bad was the condition of the workers and peasants. All the people and similarly we the poor began to form the impression that the interests of us poor were different from those of the higher class. Many had not the idea that this would involve special ideas and practices in the Swaraj constitution. They thought that Swaraj would be established if they got the powers and the offices in the hands of the foreigners, after the foreigners had gone away, and that it would not be very long for the industry and the commerce of India to come into the hands of the people of India and for India to prosper. After this idea was current for some time, the Swaraj movement began to be vigorous and the Non-co-operation movement of Gandhi began and at that time the necessity of us workers and peasants was felt in the political work of the Congress. During the same time the labour movement began and the labourers' demands were placed before the people. As the labour movement went on progressing, it came to be noticed by us labourers that the National Congress was not doing the things of benefit to the labourers. After so long a time a Declaration of Rights which laid down the rights of the masses in general was announced in the Karachi Congress. And it was also declared that the Indian National Congress was for the welfare of us poor workers and peasants. But as soon as it was said that the Congress was for the poor, the zamindars and the industrialists raised a great wail and the Congress was asked as to what was going to be done about their rights. At that time the (Congress) Working Committee gave them the assurance in order to pacify them that it would also protect their rights. From this it came to our notice that the National Congress was not for our welfare. When it has the occasion to fight with Imperialism and when it feels the necessity of men, the hollow promises are made that the Congress is for the poor and that the Swaraj is being demanded for them (the poor.) But how the upper-class men raise obstacles and how the Congress deceives the poor people when a question of the workers and the peasants occurs in the Swaraj constitution, can be understood from the assurance given to the zamindars and the industrialists by the (Congress) Working Committee. It will be easily understood on examining the condition of the labourers in other independent countries that it will not do for us workers and peasants if Swaraj be established merely according to the Congress plans. It is surprising that the Congress does not as yet realize this. One will be mistaken if one supposes that the poverty of us workers and peasants—the difficulties of us labourers—will disappear so long as the means of livelihood in the country are

not released from private ownership and made of national ownership. From my experience of the Congress for these eight years and from what I have seen of the Congress work, I have been convinced that the Congress is not for the poor. But we workers and peasants have occasion to weep in the name of the Congress in its national work. For example: when the Simon Commission came, (they asked us) to observe *hartal*, when non-cooperation began (they asked us) to go to jail, when Satyagraha began (they asked us) to break the laws; such things, these patriots, asked the ignorant people to do in the name of the nation, taking advantage of their ignorance. P.W. 104 of the Lower Court has said that along with the Workers' and Peasants' Party Alwe had joined the movement for the boycott of the Simon Commission. But this is not true. Because, as I was a member of the Bombay Provincial Congress Committee, I had participated in the Congress programme of the *hartal* declared by the Congress against the Simon Commission. This will be seen from these handbills (D 719,720).

N. M. Joshi and May Day.

P.W. 47 of the Lower Court said that Mr. Alwe had participated in the May Day celebration on behalf of the Workers' and Peasants' Party. This is not true, but the facts are as follows. In the year 1926, I heard in Bombay about May Day among us the working class. That was as follows. On the 1st of May at 4-30 P.M. Messrs. N.M. Joshi, Jinwala, Bakhle and others took out a procession in the locality of us mill workers with red flags in their hands and went about in the workers' locality distributing handbills and asking the people orally to attend the meeting. At that time, I was doing my work in the Crown Mill. While I was doing my work, I received a note signed by Mr. Mayekar, the Secretary of our Mandal. He had asked me in that note to attend the May Day meeting at 5 O'clock. At this time some workers came there with the handbills distributed by Mr. Joshi and others in their hands and began to ask me what May Day was. At that time I too was faced with the same question because I too had not up-till-then heard the name May Day. Because, though I was doing the work of organization, I had not much knowledge about the Labour movement in other countries, because I could not read or write much. Therefore I told those men that I did not know what May Day was but that they should attend the meeting in the evening where they would get the information. After I went to that meeting, I asked Mr. Joshi: "Mr. Joshi, you are holding today a workers' meeting because of May Day. Then tell us what this May Day is." At that time Mr. Joshi told me that the May Day is observed all over the world as a workers' day and that we too

must observe it. On that day, work must be stopped, big meetings held and big resolutions passed regarding the workers' interests. This is called May Day. All I understood was that May Day meant the holding of a meeting and passing big resolutions. The second May Day was celebrated (Lit. took place) in May 1928. But it cannot be said that it was specially a May Day meeting. At that time there was a mill-strike in Bombay and meetings of that strike used to be held daily, morning and evening. And the May Day was celebrated in the evening strike meeting itself. At that time, I also was present at the meeting. The president of the meeting made a speech about May Day and others also attending the May Day meeting made speeches. At that time the President of the meeting mentioned my name and asked me to make a speech. What I told the workers at that time was that if anyone wanted the full history of the May Day the educated people and the people having information about foreign countries could tell them that, but that the only thing that I had to tell was that our strike should be continued peacefully till our demands were secured. This is my information about the May Day and experience about the May Day.

The Prosecution alleges that in my speeches during the strike of 1928 I have said the workers' Raj must be established. I shall tell you the meaning of what kind of Raj that should be. All the means of livelihood of the workers and peasants who form to day the majority of the population of India must be made of national ownership. And this system of Govt. that is required must be one for the convenience and happiness of the 90 per cent people living on labour. It does not matter then whether Prime Minister in that system of Govt. is Mr. Ramsay MacDonald, Mr. Baldwin or Mahatma Gandhi. We want that system of Govt. in which the interests of us the masses are looked after. Really speaking who is the Raj today? It is those who do not get sufficient food even once (a day), who have no clothes on the body, that require the Raj today. This does not mean that they want to sit on the Emperor's throne or to become Prime Minister, but the workers and peasants want that system of Govt. in which sufficient bread for the belly and clothing sufficient to cover the body and in which the interests of the masses are (secured). Similarly in that system of Govt. every man and woman must have the right to vote. Therefore, such is the line of thought of what I meant when I spoke about the workers' Raj. I at least do not think that if any party whatsoever gets up today and raises an outcry out of sympathy for the workers and the peasants, still it will cause a change in the condition of the workers and the peasants, because, people of these various parties in the country are mainly intent on how to

get political power into the hands of their party, placing forward the condition of the workers and peasants and making puppets of the workers and peasants in order to make their (own) party strong, take advantage of their ignorance and achieve their (own) political objects. This I have realized from my experience so far. If the workers and peasants want to secure a Raj or to secure some political rights, they will be able to secure them on the strength of organization by independently organizing themselves. It is not at all possible for the workers and the peasants to secure their rights by passing into the net of other parties.

If you will take into consideration my ideas and my system of work, you will understand what my objects and my thoughts were. Vide my article in the *Kranti* dated 9.3.29. My article P. 930 dated 12th July 1928 which has been produced (against me) is quite incomplete. Sentences before and after have been omitted and such arrangement of sentences has been brought about that my ideas appear inconsistent. If you take into consideration the whole of the article, you will see that any Trade Unionist can express his thoughts in severer language. In this my article the only advice I have given the workers is that they should increase their strength, that is, they should organize big Unions and should then face the situation on the strength of those Unions. Similarly if the article in P. 953 dated 19th January 1929 is taken into consideration, you will see my thoughts that the workers do not want a strike. In that my article I have shown that what is meant by a nation is not a handful of capitalists but the worker and peasant masses. It is in their interests that the whole administration in the country must be conducted. Similarly I have shown how the owners become rich by robbing the poor and how the worker remains half-starved labouring for ten to twelve hours. If my article dated 9th August 1928 in P. 986 is seen, I have requested the mill-owners and the Govt. in that article that they should intervene and bring about an early settlement of the strike. It is an article about this.

Now in the Lower Court the charge has been made against me that Alwe had issues of the *Kranti* subsequent to November 1927 and therefore he could not be ignorant for long of the programme of the Workers' and Peasants' Party. I have to say only this much about this that the paper *Kranti* was distributed among the workers and that the paper contained news about the strike and such things as negotiations that had taken place with the owners how much of the wages of the workers had been cut down, how much the owners were prepared to restore, what the worker demands etc. Similarly the paper contained a review about strike activities and about the work of the Strike Committee. As I was an actual worker as also the President of the G. K. Union, I had to take in all those

papers which wrote about Labour matters. I myself read those which were in Marathi and got others, that is, these persons, to read to me those in English. My only object in reading and getting read these papers was that I had to see how much false news is published about us labourers, or if some false rumours are in circulation regarding the Union and if anything false occurred in it, I had to give a reply to that. And this had become quite necessary for me. Now it is not that the person taking in a newspaper takes it in order to study all things in it. Some one has a liking for the national movement, some one has a liking for politics and others for other things. Such are the different objects of taking in newspapers. To take in a newspaper does not mean to study. After the information required by one is read, not much importance is left to the paper. Now it has been said that all the issues of *Karanti* subsequent to 1927 were found with me. This is entirely false. There is only one issue of 27th Nov. and it was sent by post to the address of the editor *Bombay Chronicle*. When the reporters of newspapers came to me to ask for information about the strike or about the Labour movement, they used to leave behind the papers in their hand. That is what happened as regards the issue of 27th November. The reporter left it at my place saying: "It is a Marathi paper, you should read it." That issue got mixed with the useless issues of other newspapers with me. In all, six or seven issues of the *Kranti* were found with me and if you see these issues (you will find that) they contain a table about the cut wages of the workers and an account of the strike. This will show what my object was in taking in this paper.

An example of the work I was doing up-till-now, of how I did not get time while doing the work of the workers, of how I had to work hard in mills for sixteen hours together for getting settled complaints and of what kind those complaints were, will be shown by D. 433. (Incomplete)

Sd. K. S. A.

Sd. R. L. Yorke

1.9.31.

Alwe (continued)

And those complaints were as follows :—

Getting re-employed a worker whom the owners might have dismissed; getting paid the wages of any one who might not have received them; securing sick leave if required and if not given by the owners; in case of any change by the owners in the workers' rates, seeing what the reduction (lit. change) was and making the owners restore it; in case the officials of the owners beat the workers and took bribes from them, bringing that mischief of the officials to the

notice of the owners and trying to get the owners to check it and to stop it. Similarly, as I was the president of the G. K. Union, (I had) to attend the meetings of every mill-committee, to sign the correspondence, to see how many of the workers' complaints had been listened to by the owners and how many had come back. There were 75 such mill-committees of the G. K. Union. (I had) to see how the affairs of those mill committees were being conducted, (had) to sign their reports, (had) besides, to attend the public meeting of workers, to conduct such meetings, to attend the meeting of the Managing Committee and to conduct its work and to see whether all this work was being properly conducted or not. As I had to do such Herculean work of the G. K. Union, I did not get time even for meals or for following the profession which provided me with livelihood. Seeing, therefore, the heavy responsibility of the work that lay upon me, the managing committee of the G. K. Union resolved to give me an honorarium of Rs 50 per month for my maintenance and that resolution will be found in the minute book of the Union P. 958 dated 25. 10. 28. From this you will understand what my work was and of what kind it was.

So long the educated people were taking advantage of the ignorance of us workers. Similarly these Communists who had newly come into the workers' movement were also taking advantage of our ignorance. If that their goal is considered now, it was not their only object merely to benefit us by removing the difficulties of us labourers. These people were opposed to compromise. It seemed to be their only desire that we workers should always go on strike. They wanted revolution and it seemed to be their only desire to bring it about as early as possible in some way or the other. Though they had not to go to Geneva still they were very fond of placing before the world how many acts of bravery they had done. They were great experts in making false reports for that purpose. In that they used to behave with great indifference as to the benefit or otherwise of the workers. That (was) as follows:— They came among the workers and without hesitation asked them to go on strike. Their reason is very easy (to understand) if one thinks about it. The first reason is that they are not actual workers. The second reason is that they have no occasion to starve when a strike of the workers takes place. The third reason is that (they) get cheers in meetings. The fourth reason is that (their) name gets publicity in newspapers as Labour leaders. The fifth reason is that these men get a ready means for spreading and placing before the world their objects by taking advantage of the strike caused by the workers' circumstances. The sixth reason is that they have neither pleasure nor pain whether a worker wins or loses the strike for securing demands regarding livelihood. The seventh reason is

that if owing to the economic difficulty of the worker the strike made by the workers fails and the workers have to accept defeat, they can blame the workers saying that the workers are fools and can show that they themselves are brave warriors. The eighth reason is that if the workers win the strike on their own strength (they) get a ready means of becoming the leaders of the workers by saying, "Have you seen? Your strike was won because we were there." And these things I am telling because of my actual experience.

Now I have already said in the Lower Court that it is the right of us workers to go on strike. But it is not my object that that right should be abused and a strike should be brought about owing to some minor cause. I have been telling that this weapon of strike and this right of going on strike should be resorted to only when no other alternative is left, when the owners are not ready to listen to compromise or negotiations and as a proof of what I have said about not making strikes owing to minor causes vide P. 958 minute-book of the G. K. Union, meeting of 16. 1. 29, last resolutions (A), (B), (C). On seeing these you will realize the truth of what I have said.

Now in the meetings on behalf of the Strike Committee that used to be held during the strike of 1928, empty talk was indulged in, to the effect that the workers' Raj must be established. And at that time it had become a common subject of talk that the workers' Raj must be established. At that time words fell out of my mouth also that the workers' Raj must come. But it was not because of political objects that our strike had taken place. Therefore the speeches that were being made to the effect that the workers' Raj must be established were regarded by me only as empty talk. I, however, have in those my strike speeches roundly abused Government officers and my only object in thus abusing (them) was, (the thought) why high officials of Government should not intervene and bring about a settlement of the strike and this what I said was entirely in accordance with truth. Because, when any two parties in furtherance of their particular object come to extremes, intervention is needed and it is the duty of any ruling power to intervene thus and if it does not do that duty, it must be said to have swerved from its duty. And it was just in accordance with what I said that the Government in the end brought about a settlement between the two parties and the strike was ended.

And I have referred to 'workers' Raj' as 'empty talk. Its meaning is as follows:— How can that worker administer the ruling power, even if it comes into his hand, who gets deceived by the owners and the money-lenders because of his failure to

understand how many annas make a Rupee, because of that his ignorance? And even if such ruling power comes into the hands of the workers, it is these persons that will remain the dictators of that ruling power. Whoever be then the dictator, he who has got power in his hand will in the end try to exploit the workers and peasants. If there be any Raj of such ignorant people it is their organization and it is only on the strength of that organization that they will be able to bring about some change in their condition. So long as they are not organized, have received no education, have no knowledge as to what is their interest and what is the interest of another, tell them 'Workers' Raj' amounts to empty talk.

In the matter of the strike the Reporters [P. W. 276 and P. W. 278] have stated that they attended every meeting and one or two meetings were held each day. This their statement is not correct. Five or six strike meetings used to be held simultaneously on a single day on behalf of the Strike Committee and as proof of it I am submitting D. 721. My only object in telling this is that though I was not present at one of the strike meetings and was engaged at the Secretariat in some strike negotiations with the owners, a false report was made about me that I had attended the meeting and the speech of someone else was put in my name as my speech. A false report was made that I had stated in that speech that the police should not be there in the meetings of us workers, and on the strength of that report Mr. Kelly, the Police Commissioner of Bombay, called me by a notice and after I had gone there I was told (lit. asked) that I had made a speech in the meeting saying that the police would not be allowed to sit in the meetings to take reports, and I was shown the report of that meeting. Of course that was not my speech and I had not even attended that meeting. When I proved this by proof and adduced all kinds of proof that I was engaged that day in carrying on negotiations with the owners regarding the settlement of the strike, the Police Commissioner in my presence reprimanded the reporters for having made a false report about me. Several speeches have been brought on record as my speeches and these speeches are altogether inconsistent with my objects. Now I attended at least three hundred strike meetings and made speeches in all of them. If the record of all my speeches is seen you will easily understand all my objects and my work. If you see the thoughts of the four or five speeches put in against me and the speech D. 650, you will easily see of what kind were my thoughts. I have said in that speech that our strike was not intended to spread sedition or to capture Raj, but that we were asking the owners for an increase of two to four rupees in our wages

and that was the purpose of our strike. I have again said in that speech that, that our workers' movement was not a seditious movement, that it was a struggle between the owners and the workers and that therefore the Governor of Bombay and the Police Commissioner 'should advise their subordinates the Police not to interfere unnecessarily with the strike and not to beat us. If the speech D. 651 is taken into consideration (you will notice that) I had advised the workers to carry on our strike peacefully. Similarly if you see D. 652 [you will notice that] a request has been made to the educated people to help our uneducated workers at the time of the strike and thoughts have been expressed that our strike was just and was only for securing the demands regarding the belly. In my speech D. 653 also I have given this very advice to the workers that the strike which they have made to secure their demands, that strike and those demands were to be secured from such powerful owners and that they would have to struggle for five or six months against such powerful owners. This I had told the men even before the strike took place as also during the continuance of the strike. My object in telling (this) was that once the workers go on strike they should not retract till the demands are secured. (I also said that) I was collecting funds etc. for the workers dying of starvation during the strike. This is the nature of the advice given by me. In my speech D. 654 (I have said that) the workers (lit. they) must maintain complete peace during the strike, that if the police attack the workers on the road while going home or while at home they should silently put up with it, but should not allow peace to be disturbed, that if the workers said that the police beat them if they began to move about on the roads, then they should not all come on the roads but should stay at home and should not allow the peace to be disturbed and that as the strike was quite near success they should peacefully have patience for some time when their demands would be got. In my speech D. 631 (a) I have given the advice that instead of remaining in Bombay the men should go to their villages till our strike was settled and that the strike should be maintained till our demands were got. If you take into consideration all these my speeches you are likely to understand whether I was connected with this crime of conspiracy or whether my opinions were of that kind. It appears from my speech P. 1726 M (3) that I have said in it that Mr. Bradley was not an agent of Lancashire (but) was a Communist. I do not remember thoroughly, but I can say from memory that in this meeting of 11-6-28, a rumour suddenly arose in the workers' meeting that Mr. Bradley was an agent of Lancashire. As I was not then even acquainted with him thoroughly, suspicion arose in my mind as to who he really was. If I was to ask him, the difficulty was that I could not talk in English with him. At

that time Mr. Ghate also was present at the meeting. So I asked Mr. Ghate: "Who is this gentleman?" He [Mr. Ghate] then told me that he [Mr. Bradley] was a Communist. At that time the word Communist was quite new, therefore, I did not understand its meaning. At that time I asked Mr. Ghate what was meant by a Communist and he explained [what is] a Communist by saying that those labour leaders in England whom we call "Jahal" (extremists) in Marathi are known there as Communists. After he had told me this, I told the men in the meeting that he (Mr. Bradley) was not an agent of Lancashire (but) was a Communist. I had read in newspaper also that Government had passed a law to arrest him and send him to England. Therefore I told the men that he was a good gentleman, a labour leader and that as Government was going to arrest him and send him to England we should thank him as he was going. This is my knowledge about the Communists.

In the speeches P. 1699 which have been put in as my speeches, the reporter has absolutely murdered several of my thoughts and has put into my mouth altogether different things. And if several of my thoughts in that speech are seen they are quite proper. They are—The strike which we have made has been made because we cannot maintain ourselves on these ten or twelve rupees. We are not demanding anything more. All we are saying is that no cut should be effected in our wages of Rs 15 or 16. And if you effect a cut in these inadequate wages, the owners and the Government should consider how we are to maintain ourselves and our wives and children in such a costly city as Bombay. Elsewhere I have said that the police beat us at the instance of the owners and also compel us to work on low wages. This is quite unjust. The owner on the one hand effects a cut of rupees two the rent of the houses in which we live, as the houses also belong to these owners. In this manner the mill owners are today quite bent upon ruining the workers. And in that speech of mine I have also said that whether one be a rich merchant, a Governor or a worker, all are men and require food to eat. The governor or the rich merchants might be eating ghee and roti but we workers must get at least bread and vegetables. The worker is not a beast and has no horns etc. It is his right to live and it is equally his right to struggle for living.

Similarly in other documents put against me as my speeches, some thoughts of my own and some of his own introduced by the reporter are inconsistent with each other.

Vide P. 939, the rules of the Bombay G. K. Union. On seeing these rules you will be convinced that this was one of the recognized workers unions. Its rules were quite simple and

straightforward and only about the economic condition of the worker. And all work was being conducted in accordance with them.

P.958, meeting of 16. 10. 1928. In this meeting a resolution has been passed towards the end that if this system of two sides and three looms was to be stopped, a separate "Two sides three looms fund" should be collected for that purpose to the amount of one lakh of rupees and that the scheme should be knocked out and for that purpose five thousand persons should be got ready as a Volunteer Corps in order to collect those subscriptions and fund and that a hundred speakers out of the workers should be trained and these lecturers should explain to the workers what the standardization scheme was. Such is this resolution, and a handbill was also issued in that connection P.966. The words 'five hundred red army' have been used in P. 967 another handbill of the same character. Now as I have already said the union had a Red Flag and so people called this volunteer corps of the union Red Army, that is, the Volunteers of Red union, and the practice had come into vogue of calling it that way. The battle mentioned in the handbill is the preparation to frustrate the new scheme of the owners. It is that preparation that is called battle. And it was the secretary of the union who issued such handbills. But when once or twice I regarded the language (lit. phraseology) used by them as strange, it was necessary to bring before the Managing Committee of the Union a resolution to the effect that before issuing any handbill it (should receive) the sanction of the Managing Committee and it should be first discussed on which subject the handbill is to be issued and what language is to be used P.958 contains this resolution.

P. 786. In February 1929, there was a Hindu-Muslim riot in Bombay. This handbill was issued in connection with getting that riot pacified. I have said in it that those who are real workers should not observe the distinction that one is a Hindu and one a Musalman but should behave as brothers and should not participate in the riot. The request made in the handbill is of this kind only.

P.790. This (is in connection with) a meeting called by the union. Many men had fled to their villages in that Hindu-Muslim riot and the owners had created some trouble about their wages, so this meeting was called in order to explain what this trouble was.

P. 1464. I had issued this handbill on behalf of the G. K. Mahamandal and my object in what I had said in it was, that as the owners were not then ready to listen (to anything) there was no alternative excepting a general strike.

P. 1465. This handbill was also like the one above.

In the matter of the strike I have already said that I had to call this strike of 1928 because there was no alternative and I admit that as I was the president of the G. K. Mahamandal, the strike was called according to the rules of that Mandal.

P. 1462. I cannot understand why the prosecution has put in this handbill. Its subject matter is as follows:— The Executive Committee of the G. K. Mahamandal placed before the people the black deeds of Mayekar in the Mahamandal. If you read the whole handbill you will easily see how even a half-educated person like Mayekar was appropriating to himself (lit taking advantage of) the money of the institution of us ignorant workers. And it has been said by the Committee at the end of the handbill that Alwe would thereafter take a lead in the work of the strike, would organize the disorganized men and would try to bring about unity for a general strike, therefore, in order to help him all workers should unanimously support his work. That handbill has been signed at the bottom by the Executive Committee.

My work and objects described by me so far are quite true and this what I have said has not been said by me through fear of imprisonment by the Government or getting frightened because of the severe punishment I might get. As I am a worker, I am not afraid of jail. As far as I am concerned this small jail of Government and the big jail of the owners outside are the same. Equal grief falls to my share whether I am here a prisoner of Government in Government's jail or a prisoner of the owner in the owner's jail. If anybody says that I am afraid of imprisonment by the Government or of the coming punishment he is certainly wrong with respect to me. I have placed this my true account before the court. I had not participated in any other movement excepting the two unions the G.K. Union and the G. K. Mahamandal, and both these unions were founded by me of the labourers in the industry in which I was myself working. I cannot read or write much. I have studied only upto the first Marathi standard. Therefore my vision is not so comprehensive. I have got knowledge only about the movement for our maintenance. Now I was a member of the Provincial Congress Committee but that was not because I approved of its objects and work. But it was only in order to see how far the Congress Labours for the workers that I had become for these eight years a member of the Executive Committee of the Provincial Congress Committee.

Now as regards the charge (lit. crime) under section 121. A applied to me and as regards the conspiracy in which (the prosecution) has got me involved, I say with conviction that I am innocent.

I have never taken part in any conspiracy. I am not a communist and was never one. I am a worker (and) a peasant and it is my profession to work for (my) livelihood and in order to remove those difficulties which I felt while following the profession for (my) livelihood, I have so far been working only by legal methods on behalf of the legal Trade Unions of the workers and I consider it my duty to do this work. The charge made against me of having conspired to subvert the Raj of the Emperor is entirely meaningless and ridiculous. I was never connected with any conspiracy nor was I a member of any illegal institution. Similarly out of my 32 co-accused I did Trade Union work along with five or six of the accused from Bombay, in the belief that they were Trade Unionists. The others I had never seen up till now, nor had I corresponded with them. Similarly I had never up till now heard the name of, or seen in my life those 63 persons and institutions from foreign countries whom (the prosecution) have connected with this case. Whence can there be then any correspondence of mine with them? Now the charge against me that I conspired with the accused in this case and people from outside helping them, in order to subvert the Raj of the Emperor is entirely false and mistaken. Because nowhere has there been any connection between me, and these persons and the conspiracy. The work I had been doing up till now, was being done by me as a Trade Unionist and I have placed before you that my work. I say with thorough conviction that I am entirely innocent of the conspiracy. I have borne God in mind and told truly what I could remember and tell in a connected way. So I request the Court that I should be discharged (incomplete)

Sd. R. L. Yorke,

(Sd) K. S. A.

2-9-31

Alwe (continued)

Q. The following evidence relates to your Trade-Union and strike activities and to your other connections: documents numbered P. 526 (29), 2408 (P), 958, 944, 959, 949, 1463, 1464, 1465, 1462, 965, 967, 929, 951, 786, 790, 971, 985, 1699, 1706, 1707, 1717, 1726, 80, 986, and witnesses numbered P. W. 245, 273, 276, and 278 and as regards connections, the documents are P. 930 (kranti dated 29.7.28), P. 662, P. 193, P. 964, P. 930. Have you to say any thing about them which you have not yet said?

A. I will give in writing later on what more remains to be said about this (evidence). Whatever I have remembered I have told up till now to the best of my memory. Another thing I

have to say is that Mr. Kasle is a worken like myself and since 1925 he has off and on worked with me in the G. K. Mahamandal and was the vice-president of the G. K. Union. He has learned one or two more books than myself. Therefore, he will give more explanation about the activities of the Union and about the outside advisers. Because, as I have already said, owing to my inability to read and write, my memory is not of that much capacity. If I recollect something which remains to be said I will submit it in writing, getting it written by some one else.

Q. What about witnesses? Do you want them,

A. I have given a list. I have to call some.

Sd. K. S. A.

Sd. R. L. Yorke

3.9.31

Alwe (continued)

Q. You have read your statement and it has been corrected as required by you. Are you satisfied that it is correct?

A. Yes.

Sd. K. S. A.

Sd. R. L. Yorke

7.9.31

(Sd) A. A. Alwe

True Translation.

Sd. N. V. A.

Sataswati Machine Printing Press, Meerut U. P. (India)

TRANSLATION.

Examination of Govind Ramchandra Kasle, aged about 42, on the 8th September 1931 before me R. L. Yorke, Additional Sessions Judge, Meerut. My name is Govinda, my father's name is Ramchandra, I am Maratha by caste and a mill-worker by profession. My residence is at Masure, Police Station Malavan, Distt. Ratnagiri. I live at Bombay.

Q. Your statement in the Lower Court P 2606 was read out to you on 16. 3. 31. Is that correct ?

A. It was read out, it was correct.

Q. The evidence against you in this case is mainly under two headings (I) Workers' and Peasants' Party, and All India Workers' and Pasants' Party. (ii) Trade Union and strike activities. This evidence is as follows:—(i) P. 1353, 1343, 1344, 1373 (1), 942, 943, 945, 645, 1170 and statement of P. W. 201. (ii) 958, 944, 959, 949, 1462, 966, 967, 954, 971, 662, 776, 932, 964 and statements of P.W. 245, 273, 276 and 278. Also speeches P. 1712, 1726, 1727, 1731, 1733 and 1734.

This list I had given you about two months back. Have you to say anything about this evidence ?

A. I had got this list about two months back. But before telling about it, I have to tell about my circumstances. Our former profession was that of a peasant. I was formerly a peasant, but circumstances made me a worker. Before my arrest I was working as a fitter in the Weaving Dept in the Simplex mill. I have been working in mill since 1903. It was not by reading books that I spoke about the workers' condition. I am telling of what I myself experienced and in which I had to labour for twenty-five years. In order to clear myself from the charge against me, it is necessary for me to describe the condition of myself and of workers. Therefore, I am telling everything before telling about the charge against me. I have not received either High School or College education. I am educated upto the 2nd standard in Marathi. Therefore I do not understand what is correct and what is incorrect in Marathi. As soon as the case began I have informed (the court) that I do not know any other language. Therefore, it is impossible to understand many things in this case. I have said above that we were formerly cultivators. Our cultivation was on a small scale and we used to do it on rent. Therefore we had to pay three-fourths of the produce as rent to the landlord and it was impossible for our family to maintain itself on the remaining produce. It being impossible to maintain ourselves

on cultivation, my father came to Bombay for service in a mill even when I was a small boy. But as even his wages were inadequate, we could not maintain ourselves on it. Therefore, my elder brother came for service to Bombay some years after my father. He too was educated up to the 3rd standard in Marathi. After coming to Bombay he took up service as a boy-peon in the Telegraph Office on Rs. 7. While he was in Bombay I was in (my) village. In that village I received education up to the 11th standard in Marathi. Afterwards I too had to take service as it became difficult to manage our household expenses. It was because we had to suffer at home and my parents began to be put to trouble, that I decided to take up service in Bombay and came to Bombay at the age of 11. After coming to Bombay I took up service in the Adamji Peerbhoy mill in the year 1902 as a half-timer. I used to get three rupees and a half as wages. As I took up service my studies never progressed. Out of my wages of three rupees and a half something had to be paid as bribe to the jobbers etc. If we did not remain absent for a whole week, we used to get two annas as reward. If we happened to remain absent on some day through illness or other cause, we forfeited these two annas (the wages) for two days. As a result, the wages got considerably reduced. What was a poor worker like me to do on those reduced wages and how was he to maintain himself? This is a matter for consideration. As we were half-timers, we were given a badge. That badge we had to tie round the neck. It could be seen from that badge in which mill and in which Dept. we were working and people used to know from that badge of which owner we were the slaves. This is an example of being treated like slaves. If on occasions that badge got lost, the owners did not fail to levy a fine of one anna. At that time the mills used to work for fourteen hours with two hours overtime, that is, for sixteen hours (Vide P. W. 202). As I was a half-timer I had to work for seven hours. The mill began to work at 5 A. M., so that the workers used to get up at 3 A. M., and finishing everything to be done at home up to 4 or 4.30 A.M., and eating the *chutney* and the bread in the house, started for work. As the whole road was full of darkness we stumbled and knocked ourselves (against the ground) while going to work in the mill. As we workers had to get up at 3 A. M., we did not get full sleep and the failure to get proper sleep affected the health of us workers. Bearing such trouble I worked for one year in the Adamji Peerbhoy Mill. Then that mill got burnt which involved in calamity all those who were like me working in that mill and I lost even that service which brought me Rs. 3½. After some days I took work as a half-timer in the carding Dept. in the Greaves Cotton Mill. There I used to get Rs. 4 as wages. I worked there for one year. Thereafter the owners declared that

the mill would remain closed for twelve days (in the month). They said that besides these days, the mills would stop on holidays. This is one of the amenities provided for us by the owners: How can this mercy fail to affect us ? In the first place, the mill remained closed for twelve days and with two or three days as holidays, the mill was closed for fifteen days and so we could put in only fifteen days. As there was only fifteen days work in the mill, we used to get only two rupees. Well, were even those wages got early ? No. Two rupees as wages and they too came to hand after two months. The wages for the current month that is for September used to be received after two months that is in November. If by chance, the worker fell ill and remained at home, he got his wages after twenty days more, that is on the 20th of November. Owing to all these reasons we workers began to be considerably inconvenienced. In one month when there were many such 'stop' days, I have received seven annas nine pies as wages. If some person died at home and someone came to the mill to call (the worker), he found great difficulty in seeing the worker in the mill. And if by chance they met and on hearing the sad news, he went to the Manager to ask for leave, he was not given leave. So that (remains of the) person who had died at home remained undisposed of till that worker returned home in the evening and that dead body remained rotting there. Such were our sorrows at that time. In order to get these grievances redressed, the workers in the mill selected some men, and sent them to place the difficulties before the Manager. The reason why they were to be placed before the Manager was that we workers did not at that time know who the mill owner was. It was the belief of us workers that the Manager was the mill owner and that all things went on as directed by him. The merciful Manager got irritated with the persons who had gone to him to place before him the difficulties, got them driven out at the hands of peons and immediately by issuing a notice declared that the mill would remain closed. Then as the mill got closed, all the men working in it lost their services. Then I went to work in the Crescent or Damodar Mill. Then however, I took up work as a full-time worker and I got Rs. 7½ as wages. I was working in the blow-room in that mill. The mention of the name of that department makes the hair stand up. When working in that department, there is cotton everywhere on the body and on the face. Moreover, oil gets sprinkled over the body and gives rise to small pimples. It was only with one object that I took up work in a department thus harmful to health, and that object was to help my family with a rupee or so. My maternal uncle also was working in the same mill. One day his hand got caught in the machine and he was immediately taken to Hospital where his hand was removed from the elbow. He was in the Hospital only for

fifteen days. After recovery he came to the mill and requested the manager, that he should get something for loss of hand. But the manager did not heed that request. He was paid the outstanding wages for the one month before the hand got broken and for the fifteen days that he was in hospital, was told that owing to loss of hand, he would not be able to work properly and that, therefore, he should not there-after come to work. He went to his village on the strength of the money he got. Seeing this state of things, I left the work in that mill. Thereafter I worked at one or two places in the spinning department and then joined the weaving department in the Rughnath Thota or Bombay Industrial Mill in order to learn the work. After learning work in the weaving department, I began to work in the weaving department in the same mill. I worked for four years in that mill. Then learning the fitter's work in the same mill, I worked for some years as fitter. The Great War began at that time and imports into India stopped, owing to which the indigenous industry prospered and the prices of all other articles went up, but the worker remained where he was. There was no increase in his wages. In the Great War the owners got crores of rupees as profit, but the owner did not give the worker even a pie. During the Great War, there was an increase in room rent, in the prices of cloth and in the prices of all articles. The worker's wages remained stationary, so it was impossible for him to maintain himself on these wages, therefore, in 1917 the workers declared a strike. The leadership of the strike vested in Sir Narayanrao Chandavarkar, High Court Judge, Rao Saheb Taloherkar, Messrs. Asavale, Bole, Mr. (lit. uncle) Baptista etc. After this strike the wages of the workers increased to some extent (lit. by a certain percentage). I will tell here briefly who carried on an agitation among the workers and how, before this strike took place. It is seen from the biography of Mr. Fule that the workers' movement was first begun by the late Narayan Meghaji Lokhande. In the year 1907 Mr. Khote used to do something for the workers. Notices, petitions etc. for the men were written in his office at Kala Chowki. When there was an increase in wages owing to the strike of 1917, the workers realized that they were benefited if all of them began to get organized. There was one strike in 1918, one in 1919 and two in 1920. Its leadership vested in such leaders as Sir (Narayan) Chandavarkar, Messrs. Asavale, Talcherkar, Ghagre master, Bala Master alias Narayanrao Kadam, Jinwala, Barrister Pawar etc. In the strike of 1919, those with fixed wages received some increase as also a bonus. In the first strike of 1920, those with fixed wages got an increase of 20 per cent, and the piece-workers got an increase of 25 per cent. In the second strike of 1920 those with fixed wages got a further increase of 15 per cent while the piece-workers got an increase of 10 per cent, which

means, that since 1917, those with fixed wages got an increase of 70 per cent and the piece-workers an increase of 80 per cent. It will be seen from this that the workers secured an increase in their wages by going on strike. In the year 1920 I was serving in the Century Mill. That year the Trade Union Congress held its session in Bombay. As I knew Mr. Athavale (P. W. 191), he gave me a delegate ticket to attend the congress and several other workers were given tickets like myself and were asked to attend the congress. We had paid 8 annas as fee per ticket. Lala Lajpat Rai was the president of that congress and it was attended by big leaders like Diwan Chamanlal, Jhabwala, Omar Sobhani, Tairsi and others. As the workers also had been invited to the Conference, we had gone there. (D. 502) (Incomplete).

Sd. K. S. A.

Sd. R. L. Yorke,

8-9-31

8-9-31

Kasle (continued)

While working in the Century Mill I fell ill one day. I was, therefore, dismissed from work. P.W. 191 took me with himself to the mill and explained things properly to the Manager in English, when I was taken (back) on work. P.W. 191 has told about how the workers are beat and otherwise harassed in mills.

The prosecution has charged me with a terrible conspiracy. I do not accept the charge made against me under Section 121A, of having considered to overthrow the *Raj* of the Government. I have not tried to subvert the *Raj* of Government nor did I entertain that desire. Nor did I maintain connection with, or participate in, any secret conspiracy, or join it as member. I have participated only in the strike. The reason for participating in the strike was that I was a member of the G.K. Mahamandal and a mill worker and as a general strike took place, it was necessary for me to participate in the strike just like other men. I am not a communist nor do I understand communism. Before the strike I did not participate in any political movement nor did I incite (others) to go on strike. I have not corresponded with any conspirator, nor was I connected in any way with any conspiracy. Being a worker, I was working in the Trade Union Movement, so I do not accept the charge of conspiracy against me.

Now I will give some account of the mill in which I was working in 1921. Since 1921 I was working in the Simplex Mill. In 1923 there was a general strike owing to the stoppage of bonus. I am giving here the causes of the strike. It was in 1923 only that the G.K. Mahamandal was established. I will give an account of

it later on. In order to get the bonus the workers had to work strenuously (lit. to die) for the whole year without a single day's absence. If he remained at home for some days, he forfeited his bonus. I have already told about various such difficulties of the worker. The Bonus strike was brought about by the owners themselves. After eleven months (of the year) were over, the owners raised an outcry that they were suffering loss and could not give the bonus. When after working for eleven months, (it was time) for the workers to take Bonus (they) were told by the owners that they could not give bonus. The workers went on strike in order to get the bonus. The leadership of that strike vested in Mr. Bhatwadkar, the president of the G.K. Mahamandal in 1923, and Messrs. Alwe, N.M. Joshi, Mayekar, Rao Bahadur Asavale, Honorary Magistrate, Rao Saheb S.K. Bole, Jhabwala, Jinwala, Syed Munavar and others. Mr. Alwe has already given most of the account about that strike. It is not necessary for me to tell more. Now it is necessary for me to say (something) about the G.K. Mahamandal. The G. K. Mahamandal was established in December 1923 in the veranda on the third floor in the Wachha Building on Delisle Road. When the establishment of the G.K. Mahamandal was considered, those present included Dattatraya Atmaram Bhatwadkar, Dattatraya Ramchandra Mayekar, A. A. Alwe, Maruti Alav, Tavde, Sadhalkar, Parulekar, Shankar Dhaku Kusagaonkar, Mahadeva Parab and other workers. I was staying in the adjoining Abu Building. I was also present at that time. It was decided that there should be some institution among us workers. At that very time the G.K. Mahamandal came into existence. It was decided to take (for) the office of the Mandal room No. 10, on the 1st floor, Hejib's ~~Cinema~~ Arthur Road, Chichpokli. It was decided to take the office room in the name of Mr. Bhatwadkar. The annual subscription for members was fixed at Re 1/4/- and the office-bearers of the Mandal were elected at the same time. It was decided at that time that no outside non-worker should be taken in the G.K. Mahamandal. The president (was) Mr. Bhatwadkar, Sizing Jobber, Moti Mill, the secretary (was) at first Mr. Sadhalkar and then Mr. Parulekar, Head Time Keeper, Narayan Mill, treasurer Mr. Kusagaonkar, Weaving Jobber, Kasturchand Mill No. 13, Committee Members:- Dattatraya Ramchandra Mayekar, Wasudeva Krishna Parab, Assistant Time Keeper Simplex Mill, A. A. Alwe, Weaving Department, Crown Mill, Maruti Alav, Weaving Department, Crown Mill, Shriram Kanhoji Tavde, Planet Mill, Dying Clerk, Mahadeva Parab, Assistant Time keeper, Jamashed Mill. Similarly I (Govind Ramchandra Kasle, Weaving Fitter, Simplex Mill) was also a member (of the Committee). There were more names besides these. After some years a quarrel arose between Messrs. Bhatwadkar and Mayekar. Therefore, Mr. Mayekar opened branch No. 1 of the G.K.

Mahamandal, near Textile Mill, near (the residence of) Maruti Alav at Prabha Devi. The function of opening this branch took place on the 1st of August 1925. At that time the office-bearers of the branch were elected as follows:-President A.A. Alwe, General Secretary D.R. Mayekar, Treasurer B.T. Alwe and the Managing Committee included my name also (D. 420). Maruti Alav used to supervise the office while as we all had to go to work, I could not often (lit. at every hour) attend the Mandal. I went once in one or two months, if I went at all. Much work to increase the membership was done by Baba Kalsekar. Mr. Tavde used to do the work of Marathi writing and he was Assistant Secretary of the Mandal at that time.

Now I will give an account of the strike of 1925. By stopping the Bonus in (lit. in the strike of) 1925, the owners behaved most mercifully towards us. And though the owner was getting excessive profit he said that he was suffering a loss and he decided in 1925 to effect a cut of $11\frac{1}{2}$ per cent in the original wages, that is in the wages on which (the workers) were working. Mr. Alwe has already told about that. The men went on strike when the owners made this effort to effect reduction in wages. That strike continued for seventy-three days. There was a Joint Strike Committee in that strike also. Its president was Mr. N.M. Joshi and its members were Messrs. A.A. Alwe, Mayekar, Tavade, Asavle, Bole, Jhabwala, Jinwala and other workers. In this strike the British worker-brethren had given us rupees twenty-five thousand as help. Besides this Mr. Asavale brought a resolution in the Bombay Municipal Corporation that one lakh of rupees should be given as help to the workers. That resolution was also passed. It was resolved that work to that amount should be taken from the workers. After the strike had lasted for seventy-three days the owners had to withdraw the notice regarding the reduction in wages, seeing the tenacity of the workers and their determination not to go back to work on reduced wages. The workers won that strike.

In the year 1926 there was a strike of British worker-brethren. Therefore, a meeting was called on behalf of the Prabhadevi branch to help them. Advocate Anandrao Surve was the President of that meeting. It was held in open space near Madhav Bhawan, opposite Parel Workshop of the B.B. and C.I. Railway. At that time, in explaining the condition of the worker-brethren in England, (we) were told that they were also worker-brethren just like ourselves and that they had helped our strike and shown sympathy towards us. Such things were told and advice was given that they should be helped and the President gave five rupees himself. Some other persons who were present also contributed. Even small school children made small contributions. At that time my son Bhaskar gave one Rupee out of (that given to him for) sweatmeats. In this

manner we sent them Rs. 131 as the first instalment. Some months after this programme was over, time came for offering a welcome to a Trade union worker who had come from England. That meeting was held in the Nagu Sayaji's Wadi. Dattatraya Mayekar and others told us that he was a big gentleman from England, a Trade union official and benefactor of the workers. Then we gave him a grand reception on behalf of the Mandal. The function was celebrated by borrowing furniture etc. for the meeting from some persons.

As up till 1926, I had worked for twenty-two years, I came to know the condition of the workers. I came to understand much about their housing conditions and the reasons for their grievances and difficulties. It is necessary to note them here. I will tell first how the worker is robbed before he is engaged. Before getting work, the worker has to seek the acquaintance of some jobber. It may be said that the jobber is the chief among the men working in a Department. He has to be first given some bribe in order that he should give work. At least one visit has to be paid to his house every day for the sake of service. Every time that poor (worker) has to spend a rupee or eight annas. The worker is thus robbed even before he gets work. I will now tell here something about the Jobbers and other high officials. After a worker takes up work he has to obey whatever orders are given by the Jobber, Head Jobber, cutlooker, folding Jobber, Number-Marker, Assistant Weaving Master, Head Weaving Master and Manager and if those orders are perhaps disobeyed, we workers incur the resentment of these high officials. Then (workers) are sent away for some insignificant reason. Besides, this, there are several kinds of fines. If the 'Fani' is broken, he is fined, if the 'Kutra' is broken he is fined, if the 'Tarpole' breaks he is fined, if the 'Pikas' breaks, he is fined, if the cloth gets creased he is fined, if the cloth gets a line or some other spot, he has to take that cloth and has to pay its price. The wages are not got unless the price of cloth is paid. At times the price of this cloth exceeds even the wages. He has to incur debts in order to pay the price of the cloth. And in order to get that debt he has to fall at the feet of the Jobber or Head Jobber or some Bania or Marwadi or Pathan. And if on some rare occasion the worker's loom gets broken owing to some cause, the poor worker has to sit at home without pay for one month at a time. He does not get even his wages. If at some time the worker falls ill and stays at home, he has in the weaving department to give a substitute in cash, that is, has to pay cash. If he does not make that payment, he is sent home and if money is not paid within three or four days he is dismissed from work. He has to flatter the Jobber in order

to retain the service and to pay the money and then the Jobber at times gets (for him) a loan from a Bania or a Marwadi. But the Jobber has of course some share in it. The next day the poor (worker) goes and pays the cash. Owing to the worker being at home for two or three days he receives less wages on the pay day which again are subject to be snatched by others. If on occasions the Manager's son is to be married, subscription of one rupee each is taken, but the worker has really no connection with the marriage of the son or daughter of the Manager, but the Assistant Weaving Master, the Head Jobber and other officials bring it about and raise subscriptions from the workers (out of which) some money is spent in celebrating the marriage and the rest is pocketed by them (the officials). Similarly worship of Shri Satyanarayan is performed in the mill. This can be easily performed in hundred and fifty rupees, but a thousand rupees are collected by raising subscriptions from the workers, out of which seven to eight hundred rupees are spent on the high officials. The higher (mill) officials foist on the workers tickets for dramas and *tamashas*. It is these mill-officials that in most cases take contracts for dramas and *tamashas*. The poor workers are compelled to purchase these tickets as they are forcibly foisted upon them. If on occasions, he refuses to take the tickets, the higher official gets angry with the worker who is deprived of his service within a few days. Similarly somebody from the Head-Jobber upto the Manager brings a clock worth forty to fifty rupees and brings some broken harmonium and these are raffled, on which they raise seven to eight hundred rupees, taking contributions from poor workers of four annas each. All these reasons mean less of wages so that the poor worker has to manage household affairs by incurring debts. If (spoiled) cloth falls to his lot, he has to pay its price and in order to pay it has to incur debt from the Bania, Marwadi or Pathan. The Pathans take interest at the rate of four to six annas a rupee, and take a bond for twenty rupees for ten. If the poor (worker) be not able to sign, his thumb-impression is taken and on the bond they write only one anna as the (rate of) interest. If on the pay day, the worker does not get his wages owing to his absence, the Pathan is sure to stand at the workers' door with a big stick in hand, to use ugly abuse and on occasions he does not even hesitate to beat (the worker). If debt has been taken from the Jobber or the Head-Jobber, he takes from the worker his wages in the mill itself. When the Jobber or the Head Jobber thus takes his wages, the worker has to return home empty-handed. If he has to pay the Pathan's money the plight of life is beyond description. The Pathan stands at his door in the evening with a big stick in his hand. And this poor worker, having no money and being afraid of the Pathan stays away from him till nine or ten O'clock at night. Next day the worker goes to the

house of the Jobber or Head-Jobber and requests that the wages taken (by him) the previous day should be again given to him as a loan and the Jobber or Head Jobber pays him from his pocket or by borrowing from others and he has to give a bond for twice the amount he might have received. Then the worker arranges to pay other (claimants). If the worker on some occasion is compelled to borrow money from a marwadi, ~~then~~ the marwadi not only takes a bond for double the amount (paid), but takes eight annas from the worker for the (stamped) paper, deducts the first interest in advance and if occasionally money is left (unpaid) for two or three months, takes three months' interest for one month, counting one month thrice as "Falgun, Shimga, Holi." Such are the various difficulties threatening us workers (incomplete)

Sd. K. S. A.

Sd. R. L. Yerke

9-9-31

Kasle (continued)

WOMAN-WORKERS AND THEIR HARASSMENT.

Women also work in the reeling and winding departments in mills. They have to pay a rupee or two to the *Naikin* in order to get work. Thereafter she gives work. After joining work any orders given by the *Naikin* have to be obeyed, otherwise she (the worker) is dismissed for some insignificant reason. On the pay-day she has to pay a bribe of from eight annas to a rupee or two to the *Naikin*. They have to pay her one or two rupees more in order that they should get more material (yarn etc). On holidays and feasts she has to be given part of the things prepared at home. In this way women workers are much harassed in mills.

THE PLACES WHERE THE WORKERS LIVE.

The working population is predominant mostly from Jacob Circle to Nagu Sayaji's Wadi. The working class lives in the locality from the Victoria gardens to Sivri, from there onwards Nagu Sayaji's Wadi, Varli, Prabha devi, Fergusson Road, Delisle Road Chinchpokli. The road in this locality is such that dust passes into the nose and the mouth continuously day and night. The chawls of the workers are dirtier even than cattle-pounds. The few chawls that have more than one storey have twenty to thirty rooms on each storey. Each room is five to seven feet in width and seven feet in length. Every chawl has three or four latrines, and one or two pipes. The latrines are so dirty that one is disinclined to use them. The workers have to go to work in the morning which causes such a (hurried) confusion that if they get water

they do not get a latrine, and if they get a latrine, they do not get water. We workers have to face several such difficulties. As the rent of the small rooms there is eight or nine rupees, it is very difficult for the workers to hire more than one room. Chawls with a single floor are extremely inconvenient. Such chawls are on two sides of an empty space and the chawls being on both sides the municipality has constructed drains by the side of the rooms which greatly vitiates the air. In rainy days the water accumulates to the rooms, which gives rise to diseases like fever which make the worker ill. There is perpetual darkness in the chawls. The sun's light cannot be seen in several chawls. It is impossible to get pure air in chawls, because owing to the mills round about, small particles always get mixed in the air. Similarly owing to absence of sun-light, the stench created by water in the mud is not removed. Absence of pure air and sunlight affects the worker's health and he falls ill. The worker's rooms and chawls are always sooty. They are whitewashed once in a year, at the pleasure of the owner. Owing to such dirty rooms and dirty chawls and several difficulties like inconvenience as regards water, latrine and air, we workers get sick. Cement chawls have been constructed for us workers. They are situated at Varli, Delisle Road (and) Naigaon. Men live to some extent in the chawls at Delisle Road and Naigaon but all the cement chawls at Varli are nearly empty because disease is frequent there. It is these chawls that were transformed into a jail during the Hindu-muslim riot in order to keep men in detention. Though the rooms are small eight or nine men live in them. The room is inadequate for sleep. We are faced with several such difficulties.

OPPRESSION ON THE WORKERS AFTER THE 1925 STRIKE.

It may be said that the owners felt sorry for the workers' victory in the strike of 1925. And it appears from their policy, nay their behaviour, that they had decided to vanquish the workers in some way or the other. The owners kept quiet for some days after the strike was over. If they had created trouble then, the workers would have immediately put a stop to it. But as the owners are very sagacious, they did not do so, because they knew that the worker would not at that time allow them to do anything. After some days had passed they began to oppress the worker. And I shall give my own experience as regards this oppression. I was working in the weaving department in the Simplex Mill (D. 503). There were in all nine fitters and four *bigaris* in that department. Out of these, five fitters and four *bigaris* were reduced, so that we four had to do their work, but did not get an increase in wages. The fitters used to come to work at 8 a.m. and to leave at 5-30 p.m.,

but instead of that, they were asked to come to work at 7 a. m. and leave work at 6 p.m. The over-time (allowance) that we got was also stopped. The work increased, the 'time' increased, but there was not an increase of even a pie in the wages. To understand this, see the monthly journal of the Bombay Mill Workers' Union of 15. 11. 28, page 4, columns 1-4 (D. 435 (2)).

While (I) was in the Simplex Mill, my sister died at home, so I was called (home). I told the manager this, but he did not give me leave. Not only that but he said: "Why there are deaths at your homes only and not at ours?" After the mill closed, I went home and then performed her funeral. According to the *Shashtra*, the ashes of cremated body have to be thrown into the sea the next day. I had to go for that purpose, so I could not go to work that day and sent word with the Assistant Time-keeper, living in the neighbourhood that I could not attend work that day and requested him (The Assistant Time-keeper) to tell the Manager all about my sister's (death) which was known to him. The next day I went to work but the manager cut off my two days, one on which I had worked and the other on which I was absent. When going to work I had taken with me the death-certificate of the Municipality, but the manager did not care for it. The owners were preparing a scheme after the strike of 1925. The owners must have spent one or two years in the preparation of that scheme. After it was ready (they) began to put it into effect. This is called the "Three looms two sides" system. A man works on two looms. Three looms were foisted on him, that two men had to do the work of three. A man works on one side, he was to be made to work on two sides and one man was to be sent away. The system was introduced of reducing men in this way, increasing the time and taking work in the same wages. The Sassoon and Finlay (Mills) probably decided to introduce this scheme, because it was in those mills that it was first begun. Therefore those mills went on strike. The Appollo Mill went on strike (lit. came out) in January 1927. It was in that mill that this system had been introduced. There was afterwards a strike in the Sassoon and Finlay mills. As the workers went on strike, the owners said that they would stop the system. Then the men began to go (back) to work. The owners created dissensions among those workers and again introduced the system in the same mill. Then after this system had been introduced in several mills, fifteen to twenty-thousand men became unemployed. While this was the position, a dispute arose in the G. K. Mahamandal between Mr. Mayekar and the Executive Committee. In order to inform the people about it, the President, A. A. Alwe, issued an explanatory handbill in the name of the Executive Committee. The prosecution has brought this handbill on the record (P. 1462). I

have following explanation to give about this:— I was a member of the Executive Committee of the G. K. Mahamandal, but as I was on work and owing to house-hold difficulties I did not go to every meeting of the Executive Committee. So it was not possible (for me) to come to know every thing about the Mandal. The executive committee suspected that Mr. Mayekar had caused confusion in the accounts and in that connection a committee was appointed to examine these accounts. In that committee Mr. Mayekar even accounted for some of the items. But the money spent and that account did not tally. The committee realized this. Besides this, Mr. Mayekar pocketed the money paid by the men by collecting subscription. Mr. Mayekar had received this money and passed a receipt for it. The account of that money, however, was not shown to the committee. The committee saw such misappropriations and the committee appointed to examine accounts submitted the whole thing to the Executive Committee again examined the whole account and when it noticed that there was confusion in it, it decided that as Mayekar had deceived us poor workers, and had squandered the money collected by us workers in the Mahamandal by way of subscription, that thing must be placed before the people. The executive committee had authorized Mr. Alwe, the president of the G. K. Mahamandal, to issue that handbill. It is not understood why the Prosecution has put in this handbill. Because it was our duty to lay before the people the trickery of a teacherous person. When the committee had proved that Mayekar had misappropriated money in any way he liked, the whole of which was collected with the Mahamandal by the poor (workers) paying subscriptions of four annas each, it would have amounted to treachery with workers to cover that affair. As Mayekar had caused such confusion in the Mahamandal he was dismissed from the Mandal. Vide P. 1463. I cannot say unless I see the handbill in manuscript, whether the handbill P. 1462 has been signed by me or not. My name might have been put in as I was a member of the executive committee.

CAUSES THAT LED TO THE STRIKE OF 1928.

Nearly fifteen to twenty thousand persons had been rendered unemployed owing to the introduction of the three looms two sides (system). There was a reduction of 15 to 20 per cent in the wages. The hours of work had been increased. Exorbitant fines were inflicted for some minor reason. Bibery was rampant in the mills. The workers were being dismissed owing to insignificant reasons. Despotism reigned in the mills. The worker felt harassed owing to these reasons. I too felt considerably harassed. Because how were eight persons to be maintained on low wages, how was the debt to be repaid, how was the room-rent

to be paid, how were the children's school fees to be paid, how were they to be educated and how were other worldly things to be done? It had become impossible for me and similarly also for the other workers to do all these things.

Sd. K. S. A.

10-9-31.

Sd. R. L. Yorke.

Kasle (Continued).

It was the opinion of the executive committee of the G. K. Mahamandal that the 1927 strike of the Sassoon and Finlay groups should be fought out. It was decided in the Executive Committee of 4-3-28 that a general strike should not be called as far as possible. Vide the minute book of the G. K. Mahamandal. The Mahamandal tried all sorts of efforts to avoid the general strike; but the owners frustrated all of them. The workers had to declare a general strike having no other alternative. The strike began on 16th April 1928. My mill worked till the 24th of April and till that time I was on work. As the mill closed, I too had to remain at home. All the mills went on strike on 26th April 1928. The leadership of the workers' strike came to the G. K. Mahamandal. Shortly after the strike began, Messrs. N. M. Joshi and Jhabwala opened talks regarding the formation of a strike-committee. We said that a strike committee should be established if half of the representatives are taken from the G. K. Mahamandal. They accepted that. A Joint Strike Committee was established on 4-5-28. It contained 30 representatives in all. There were 10 representatives on behalf of the Textile Labour Union or Girni Kamgar Sangh of Mr. N. M. Joshi, five of them were workers and five outsiders. Out of these the outsiders were Joshi, Jinwala, Asavle, Parulekar and Syed Munavar and the remaining five were workers. (There were) five on behalf of Mr. Jhabwala's Mill Workers' Union. All of them were outsiders. They were: Jhabwala, Dange, Nimbkar, Mirajkar (2nd) Bradley. There were in all fifteen representatives on behalf of the G. K. Mahamandal and all of them were workers. They were: President A. A. Alwe, Dhuri, Gadkari, Savant, Pendnekar, Ausekar Tamhanekar, Tavde, Kadam, Khanderao Desai, B.T. Alwe, myself, Ghogale etc. (Vide P.W.245). There were twenty worker-representatives, five on behalf of Mr. Joshi's Union and fifteen on behalf of the Mahamandal. From this (it will be seen that) the workers were in a Majority of the Strike Committee (and) if you take into consideration the history of the strike, you will realise that it was with the help of their majority of votes that work of maintaining peace and distributing grain was proceeding systematically. During this six months strike, the worker suffered the pangs of hunger etc., he

suffered in various ways, his household (goods) were subjected to attachment etc. and he did not allow his peace to be disturbed in the least. From this you will realise that this was not a political strike but was purely one intended solely to ward off the attack made by the owners on the workers' wages.

Reasons for the establishment of the G. K. Union though the G. K. Mahamandal existed.

The owners began to say that they were prepared to carry on talks only with a Registered Union. A letter to that effect from the owners was received by Mr. Joshi. Therefore, the executive committee of the Mahamandal decided that if the owners were prepared to carry on talks, the G. K. Mahamandal should be registered. And Mr. Alwe and some workers went in order to get the union registered. Mr. Mayekar had been dismissed from the Mahamandal. We were told in the Registration Office that a union by the name of G. K. Mahamandal had been registered by Mr. Mayekar. A detailed account about this has already been given by Mr. Alwe in his statement. As two institutions cannot be registered with the same name, it was decided by the executive committee of the G. K. Mahamandal that another union should be started and registered and that if a settlement was possible it should not be stopped because the union was not registered. It was the rule of the Mahamandal that outsiders should not be taken into the Union. Mr. Alwe said that these men were such as would do the workers' work only according to Trade Union (method) and that they would do well the work of the workers, that the (workers) had to go elsewhere if correspondence had to be carried on in English but that these would write it. We had confidence in Mr. Alwe. As we were on work, the executive committee had given him all authority. Therefore, trusting in what he said, we did not make further inquiries about the outsiders as to they were and what they did. After Mr. Mayekar had got registered the G. K. Mahamandal, this new union, the G. K. Union came into existence, as two unions cannot be registered under the same name. This (G. K. Union) was established on 22nd May 1928 in Nagu Sayaji's Wadi, under the Presidentship of Mr. Alwe. The new elections of this union took place in the same meeting. At that time all the officials of the old Mahamandal again stood for election. Similarly, these outsiders also stood for election. I have said above that I myself and similarly our workers had no information as to who and what these outsiders were. But as Mr. Alwe sang their praises that they were Trade Unionists working in the interests of the workers, similarly that they were selfless persons, Congressites, servants of the country etc., that election

was not opposed, but not that they were elected unopposed, even in that meeting there was some commotion about these outsiders, to the effect that outsiders were not required in our union. Such was the argument (lit. debate) put forth by some persons. Mr. Alwe placed some difficulties before the men. They were as follows:—Work is delayed and difficulty is felt at every step as there is no one among the workers' union who can read and write English. The work of the union cannot be carried on in the proper way it should, that is (as regards) English correspondence with the owners, carrying on negotiations with the owners in English, etc. As Mr. Alwe placed all these (things) before the eyes of the men, the commotion got appeased and the programme of election was carried through. From that day, I became acquainted with these outsiders. I had never seen them before that, nor was I also acquainted with them. The election of the office-bearers of the G. K. Union took place. It was as follows:—President: Alwe, Vice-presidents: Tamhanekar, Jhabwala, Bradley, Nimbkar; Secretaries: Danage, Tavde, Satam, Joglekar; Treasurers: B. T. Alwe and Ghate, I knew Mr. Jhabwala before I came to know these men, but I was not closely acquainted with him. The executive committee was elected and I also was elected to it. The number of (the members of) that committee was over fifty, If this is to be seen, vide P. 662 photograph of the executive committee. It includes thirty to thirty-five members of the committee but many persons were absent when this photograph was taken and so it is incomplete. Though this union was born during the strike, the work of the strike, however, was being conducted through the Joint "Strike" Committee. Now if I begin to give an account of this big six month's strike, it will be a big volume (and) it will be wasting unnecessarily the valuable time of the Court. Therefore, I will tell in brief. The point I want to make is that this strike which we workers made and the part we took, was because the strike was not of a political nature. If you look to our strike demands, you will easily realise that this strike was intended solely to ward off the attack made by the owners on the wages of us workers. Mr. Alwe has already stated in his statement all the demands of the workers which were put forth (lit. existed) when this strike was settled in the Secretariat through the intervention of the General Member Sir (Ghulam Hussain) Hidayatullah. It is not necessary to state those demands here. The worker's leaders said that the strike would be called off, if after discussion between the General Member (Sir Ghulam Hussain) Hidayatulla, the representatives of the owners and the representatives of the workers, those demands were granted. The strike was called off when the demands were accepted, but the above demands were accepted till the report of the Pawcett Committee was out.

My Speeches:—

From all these things, you will note that this strike was not of a political character, but I will tell here briefly about the speeches I am alleged to have made during this strike, speeches, giving a terrible form to which the prosecution is trying to get me entangled in this conspiracy. I will give a brief account of the attack of the police against us, during strike days, that is, when the strike for securing the demands regarding livelihood of the workers was being peacefully carried on. Beating the workers after going to their homes when they might be sitting peacefully at home, asking them forcibly to work on reduced wages, attacking the workers' meetings being carried on by them peacefully, attacking workers with *Lathis* when they were returning home after finishing meetings, taking to the Police *chowki*, keeping shut there and beating any worker that they may come across, beating worker-volunteers, imprisoning them by accusing them of whatever they liked, and doing such other things—seeing all this and being harassed though lack of food and water, and seeing the sufferings of the children at home, I might have on some occasion used bad language in a fit of anger or through vehemence; but the object of my speech, however, was not that of spreading or creating hatred about Government in the minds of the people or of preaching (lit. making) sedition. All this—getting tired of the circumstances of the time or getting helpless, some bad things might have come out of my mouth. Some (things) in those speeches might have been true, some might have been interpolated by the Reporters. I do not say that I did not make speeches. I have already said in the Lower Court that I had made speeches. In the matter of the speeches the Marathi reporters wrote one thing, they wrote another from the shorthand (notes) and wrote quite a third in English. All my speeches are only confined to the strike. Our bad condition had its result (on me), so bad words might have on some occasion come out of the mouth, (but) the object was not to subvert the *Raj* or to give incitement in any other way. The only object was in what way the strike would be maintained. I did not attend any political meeting either before or after the strike. My work was confined only to Trade Unions (to be continued).

Sd. K. S. A.

12 9. 31.

Sd. R.L. Yorke.

Kasle (Continued)

Sir Leslie Wilson the Governor of Bombay, had heard about the Police oppression. Vide P 439 (20). As I have said

before about my speeches, I might have condemned the Police but I do not accept several things like "beat, thrash" which have been put in by the Reporter in my speeches. I did not at all use such words. Vide P 966. It has been said in it that Satyagraha should be offered, that boycott should be declared, that preparation should be made for boycott. Handbill P 966 will carry conviction about the work we were doing. It has been said in that handbill that the system of three looms and two sides should be smashed, that strike should be made peacefully and that Satyagraha should be offered.

Now I will speak about the peasants' and workers' Conference of Calcutta (P 942, 943, 945). I had not gone to Calcutta or to the Jharia Trade Union Congress. P. W. 254 has written in his report the name of my son B. G. Kasle as having attended the Conference. But while identifying me in the Lower Court he said that Kasle was present at the Calcutta Conference. This his statement is quite false. His evidence is not at all reliable, because in this (lit. higher) court, he omitted my name. The statements he had made about some other persons are such that he (P. W. 254) has in his report given as having attended for all the three days the names of those who did not at all attend the Conference and of those who attended on some day for some time. Besides this, P. W. 254 did not identify Gauri Shankar in the Lower Court and said, while identifying (him) in this (lit. higher) court, that he had identified Gauri Shankar in the Lower Court, but the Magistrate might not have noted that. By this statement he has even made the Magistrate false. P.W. 36 also has made a report about the Conference. P. W. 254, while giving evidence in this court omitted my name at first, but stated during cross-examination that Kasle was pointed out to him by somebody there, that Kasle was sitting with his back turned towards him, that the person appeared like Kasle. See evidence in lower (court) of P. W. 179 and in this (lit. higher) (court) of P. W. 254. It is understood from P. 459, which contains the photograph of my son, how false is the evidence given by this witness. You yourself have seen this my son after he had come here (and can see) what a great difference there is between his photograph and my photograph. Besides this, the witness has also said that my initials were B. G. Kasle and he did not know even my initials. According to his report only one Kasle had attended the Conference and his name was B. G. Kasle. Besides this, in the report of the conference P 334, page No. 87, para No. 3, it has been stated that B.G. Kasle, a small school boy, son of a Bombay mill-worker, spoke in the Conference. From all this, it is clear that I was not present at the Calcutta Conference. But my son had gone to see Calcutta.

In this way the evidence of P. W. 254 is entirely false. Exhibits P 942, 943, 945 are from my search. All that property might have been brought by my son and might have been got in the search along with his articles and books. P. W. 201 has said that it had got written on it the names 'B. G. Kasle' and 'M. G. Kasle'. This property that had been brought (by my son) has been foisted upon me. As I was working in a mill what else could be got at my house? I did not read newspapers, nor was I making secret plots anywhere, nor was I connected with any secret conspiracy. In this way, I do not accept the grave charge made against me, the tremendous stress laid by the Prosecution, stress to the effect that Kasle knew everything. After I came here and the case proceeded, I have heard the mention of (lit. of where) 'communist', 'L̄eninism', 'Germanism'. I am hearing all this after coming here. We had never heard this (before). My only ideal was only this much: how my children and family would be protected and how our improvement could take place by a legal method.

Now I will speak about the Workers' and Peasants' Party of Bombay. P 1343-1344. I have been charged with being a member of the Workers' and Peasants' Party of Bombay. I have already said about that in the Lower Court that many persons come to us and ask us to sign some paper, some written form (or) petition. As we cannot read or write and do not know laws and regulations, advantage is taken of our ignorance and signatures are taken from us by telling us such things as "(We) do good things for you; (these) things are beneficial to you, (I) have to go into the Council on your behalf, I am going to stand for municipal (election) in your interests, we shall try to remove your difficulties. Similarly, some one might have come to me and might have told me that the things were of benefit to the workers and peasants and after telling this, might have taken my signature. I have already said that my profession was that of a cultivator and that I was also working in a mill. So I might have signed that form. The form on which my signature is shown, is in English. I have already said that I do not know English and none read out to me the rules of that Party, nor had I paid the subscription. Vide P.1343. Nor did I attend any meeting, nor did I get any intimation in that respect. I was present at the meeting P 1373, (1). What I remember about that is that on that day I had gone to a workers' meeting—meeting of the workers of the Victoria mill—at Chaupati. When I went, I had with me Messrs. Tralkar and Kandalkar. As there was much time before the meeting, we entered Mr. Ghate's residence on the way. At that time talk arose about the union, about subscriptions etc. At that time talk was started about outside clerks and I said about the appointment of outsiders on Rs. 5 a day: "Why should

out-side non-workers be brought into the Union? Instead of appointing fifteen men by paying each one five rupees daily, the workers who are unemployed should be paid a rupee daily and should be appointed to write Marathi receipts. What is the necessity of paying outsiders five rupees daily? Some workers can write ordinary Marathi. Many such workers are unemployed and they should be given work. That will help the unemployed workers, as also reduce the expenditure of the union. Why are educated outsiders required?" At that time there was a dispute between me and our other men, and Dange etc., and because of that I left the place for the workers' meeting at Chaupati. I had not gone to the meeting of the Workers' and Peasants' Party, nor had I been invited in any way. Vide Para No. 5 of P 1344, page No. 107.

(I) will (now) tell about P 645. It is impossible for me to know why my name and address was written in Mr. Bradley's diary. I cannot say with what object he wrote that address. He alone knows about it.

P 652, 776, 932, 964 are incomplete photographs of the Managing Committee of the G. K. Union. These were taken some fifteen days after the election of the G. K. Union took place. All the members of the Managing Committee had been asked to gather together in the Damodar Hall at 10 A. M., for being photographed, but the photographer said that at ten o'clock there would be too much of sunlight and that the photograph would not come out well, so the photograph should be taken in the morning. As the members of the Managing Committee had been informed beforehand (about the fixing of time as 10 A.M.), the photograph of only those persons was taken who were present. All the members came at 10 o'clock but the photographer had already taken the photograph and gone away. So all could not be included in the photograph. Therefore, these photographs were incomplete. I also was a member of the Managing Committee; therefore, my photograph has also been included in them.

(Now I) tell about P 959, P949, P971, P954. (This) is an account of amounts taken from the G. K. Union for being spent on sundry expenses for the work of the union. I have already said that I was a member of the Managing Committee of the union and subsequently became (its) Vice-President. Therefore, I had to go to the mills etc., in order to settle the complaints of the workers and to remove any difficulties and sufferings. Therefore, I used to take money for gharry hire etc., and used to give receipts for being placed before the Committee. From these the account was written as to how much money had been taken either by myself, or by others and how much had been spent. It (the account) includes my name.

P 944 is a paper which has (written) on it the names of the members of the Managing Committee of the G. K. Union. These include my name also. How can I say from the paper, who wrote it and why? If that paper is seen, it has on it only the names of the persons of the Managing Committee, there is no point, no subject in it. So I cannot say more about such a paper. This paper is not in my handwriting. Perhaps the names of the members of the Managing Committee, might have been written in order to recognize them.

P 958 is the minute-book of the G. K. Union. I have said above that I was formerly a member of the Managing Committee of this Union and after Mr. Jhabwala had resigned his Vice Presidency, the workers appointed me in his place. I was Vice-President since that time till my arrest. So, I had to attend the meetings of this Committee and it is natural that my name should be mentioned in it. I also used to bring before that committee resolutions of interest to the workers. Because, it was a Union purely of us workers and I considered it to be my duty to work in this union as I was a worker. In the Managing Committee of the G. K. Union, there were upto eighty worker members like myself. There was a mill committee in every mill. There were many such men of all the mill-committees. It was through the workers that the whole work of the union was being carried on. All explanation about this has been given by Mr. Alwe. Therefore, I too do not like to say more in this matter. But I, however, have to say (something) about these four or five outsiders. If these have made some secret plot behind (the backs) of us workers and of the Managing Committee or have tampered behind our (backs) with the work of the union, taking advantage of our ignorance, or have made some secret plot, only God knows it. We are not responsible for it, they themselves are responsible. The only thing to be said about the work of this union is that this Union was registered according to Government rules and was a respectable institution working for the economic condition of us workers, and if its work and rules are seen by you, you will understand that it was not an illegal institution. Now P 966 and P 967 are handbills published on behalf of the G. K. Union. But I find my name on them. The Secretary of the Union used to issue handbills. I saw the handbills after they had been issued, when they contained such big, big words as 'Lal Fauja' (Red armies) etc etc. What the object of the secretary was in using such big words and dignified language can be said only by him. Now, if the owners did not stop the system of three looms and two sides, the workers should resort to Satyagraha in order to stop the oppressive system and should get it stopped. What power is there in our hands by which we can stop the system of three looms and two sides? That

(power) is Satyagraha, boycott. While explaining my speeches, I have told about Satyagraha and boycott. The words used in the handbill about five hundred or five thousand red army (refer to) the Volunteer Corps of the Union. We called it 'Volunteer Corps' but only God knows what was the object of the Secretary in using the words 'Red Army'. We used to call it Volunteer Corps alone. Volunteers were required to offer peaceful Satyagraha and Volunteers are required to collect Union subscription in the mills. Besides this, volunteers were necessary to maintain order in meetings. Such a Volunteer Corps had not been raised only at that time, but was in existence since the foundation of the G. K. Mahamandal.

Sd. K. S. A.

Sd. R. L. Yorke

14-9-31

Kasle (Continued)

The Managing Committee of the G.K. Union had reprimanded the Secretary for using words like "Red Army." Mr. Alwe has given a detailed explanation as regards this handbill.

Efforts made by these persons to get me out of the Union.

I have to tell here briefly about the effort made by these (persons) to get me out of the union. After I became the Vice-president of the union, I could not pull on with these (persons), so Mr. Dange was making a conspiracy against me in order to get me out of the union. If you have to see this, vide the minute book of their party P. 1344, page 109, meeting of 3. 2. 29.

The reporters have made an attempt to show in their report that in my speech P. 1727, I have called Mr. Nimbkar 'Guru'. But that is entirely false, for, it was not at all possible for the relation of disciple and Guru to come into existence between Mr. Nimbkar and myself. If there was any relation between Mr. Nimbkar and myself, it was that of plaintiff and defendant. Not that I am saying this here but you will realise it if you see how, before my arrest, there were clashes, every hour, every day, every time, between the Nimbkar clique and myself. Vide D. 435, *Majoor-Bandhu* dated 3. 3. 29, heading 'Nimbkar versus Kasle' columns 1 & 2, page 1, D. 435 (3). I am showing only this one instance (lit. point) here, had I been on bail I would have got an opportunity of showing how there were clashes between myself and the Nimbkar clique. Had I got facilities to get papers regarding the dispute between me and these (persons), I would have shown with proof that they were opposed to me and I was opposed

to them. I have not got here the proofs for that, so I have to rest satisfied with this small proof. Similarly you will be able to see how in their paper the *Krantii*, they were making false statements about me. *Krantii* 10. 3. 29, heading 'Mr. Kasle's Threat,' (D 722). Several of their efforts against me through the paper *Krantii* can be shown, but I am helpless because of illness. I will give them in writing afterwards in (my) written statement.

I will tell briefly about the documents which have been put in as my speeches. I am myself a worker. During the strike of 1928, I had been reduced to a condition of penury. Persons at home were starving. The workers had made a strike in order to ward off the attack made by the owners on their wages. Besides that, the oppressive system of three looms and two sides was also to be stopped. The police had no connection whatsoever with the strike made by us for our bellies. But the police used to harass the workers any way they liked, used to beat the workers soundly, used to arrest the volunteers and beat them in the *Chawki* (police station) as much as they liked. After seeing all these pranks of the police, I might have protested against their action, but I have never used such violent language as that they should be beaten or driven away. If my speeches are read, the sentence above, (will be found) not to be connected with the sentence below. Bombastic words have been introduced in them. From all this, I think that the reporters have interpreted my thoughts any way they liked. From the fact that Rai Saheb Trivedi P. W 254 said that I had gone to Calcutta, even though I had not gone there, you will realise how (false) reports are (unscrupulously) made. I have never used the word 'communism' in my speeches. The reporter has stated in his report that I have in my speeches said that we wanted the workers' Raj. I have to give some explanation about that. My definition of 'workers' Raj' is different than that of others. As the workers are uneducated, they are deceived by the *bania*, the *marwadi* and other savkars (money-lenders). Similarly ^{and} officials practise deception in the matter of wages, they also practise oppression and highhandedness. 'Workers' Raj' means education for workers' children good rooms for workers to live, (and) sufficient clothing. When this is got the workers get pleased. This is what is (meant by) their *Raj*. Right of citizenship for the workers. Places for the workers in the Councils and in the Assembly (are required). My speeches always aimed at the benefit and reform of the worker. At present the workers in England are carrying on the *Raj*, while the workers in India cannot calculate accounts. From which (it will be seen) that the workers' *Raj* means their education their economic

improvement. We have no objection whether the question of the livelihood and economic improvement of the workers is solved during the ministry of Ramsay MacDonald, of Baldwin or of Mahatma Gandhi. The speeches I made were not made with the object of subverting the Emperor's *Raj* or of spreading sedition. Nor (did I make the speeches) because I had to maintain (my) ' Leadership' by bringing about a strike, or had to maintain myself on the money of another country. Nor had I to parade my greatness in the name of the workers. I had not to take advantage of the ignorance of the workers by making a secret plot. I myself am ignorant. I took part in this strike and made speeches solely in order that the oppression to which the workers were being subjected should be removed. I am not a communist nor do I understand what communism is. I am a worker. It was solely in order to solve the question of livelihood that I was working for ten to twelve hours in a mill. I could not, owing to illness, state the points which I wanted to state systematically. As I am ill my head is not steady (and) in that condition I might have omitted something and stated something unnecessarily (Lit. less or more). Just as I begin to think of a point it disappears owing to the agony of my illness and the thought about that point is interrupted. In such circumstances I am somehow completing my statement as desired by the court. You are seeing my condition. I shall give in writing any points missed by me and those points which require to be systematically stated, after my condition improves.

Now, I am entirely innocent of this terrible charge under section 121 A that has been brought against me. If you see my thoughts, as described by me, and my work, (you will realise that) I have worked according to Trade Union methods in order to get by legal methods out of the economic condition. My object and efforts were solely for solving the question of the livelihood of the workers. From this what I have said, I am entirely innocent of the charge brought against me of having conspired to subvert the *Raj* of the Emperor. Therefore, the Court should discharge me. I had no connection with the outsiders in this conspiracy, nor had I corresponded with anybody, nor had I made any secret plot with any one. Leaving aside five or six persons from Bombay, I did not even know before this, any one else in the conspiracy. I have already said why I got acquainted with these five or six persons from Bombay. If Mr. Alwe had not given an assurance about them they would not have got an entrance at least into our millworkers' movement. Because it was a rule of the G.K. Mahamandal, that no outsider should be taken into the union. But Mr. Alwe brought these (persons) in and said that they were well-educated persons, patriots

and congressmen. And that is true also. Because up till now they were congress members. But after coming here I see everything contrary to (what I thought). Some one says he is a Communist, some one 'Marxism' some one 'Germanism' and some one 'Fascism'. When they were arrested and we came to Meerut, most were devotees of KHADDAR. The late Pandit Motilal Nehru, (Pandit) Jawaharlal, (Mrs) Sarojini Naidu, Mahatma Gandhi etc. had come here to see these (persons), and (they) gave help for defence according to their ability, but I see now at the time of the statements that everything is contrary to (what it was) and every one is being abused.

I am not connected with any illegal institution. Up till now I spent the days of my life in solving the question of livelihood, working for twelve to fourteen hours in a mill and used somehow to pass the days of my life in a half-starved condition eating the dry bread that I could get. But when these five or six persons of Bombay joined the strike, (there came in) somewhere secret conspiracy, somewhere Leninism, somewhere Communism, somewhere

Marsanism, somewhere Fasinism*. I had no connection with such secret plots of these (persons).
* Apparently Marxism and Fascism. Only this much is true. By coming into the strike of us workers these persons did, on the contrary, only one thing. The securing of all the demands remained aside but a poor worker like myself had to come to the Meerut Jail and to suffer* for two and a half years.

*The literal From all this my account, it will be easily seen by meaning of the you who I was and what thoughts I might have had. word used in . No expert PANDIT is required to understand that. the original is, to make a Forceful sound, as at stool etc.

For these two years you are closely examining this case, so you must have realised how far I had a connection with the conspiracy. These my Bombay friends persecuted me not only outside, they did not hesitate to persecute me even in jail. I finish my statement with the humble request that none of my worker-brothers should let themselves be influenced by such persons.

If the Judge Sahab considers my case minutely, it can be easily seen how I got involved in the matter of the conspiracy and I finish my statement with the prayer that God should lead him to consider minutely.

Q. Do you intend to call witnesses?

A. The Court can decide justice or injustice, without the help of witnesses. (Concluded).

Sd. K. S. A

Sd. R. L. Yorke

15-9-31

KASLE (Continued).

Q. Your statement has now been read out to you and has been corrected as desired by you. Are you now satisfied that it is correct?

A. Yes.

Sd. K. S. A.

16-9-31

Sd. R. L. Yorke

Sd. Govind Ramchandra Kaste,

Saraswati Machine Printing Press, Meerut, U. P. (India).

आर्. एल्. यार्क आय्. सी. एस्. अॅडिशनल सेशन जज्ज, मेरट्, वांचे कोर्टांत

बादशाहा विरुद्ध पी. स्पॅट व इतर

मुकदम्यांत कि. मो. फो. १८१८, कलम ३४२ अन्वये.

एक्झॅमिनेशन- गोविंद रामचंद्र कासले वय सुमारे मिस्टर आर्. एल्. यार्क साहेब अॅडिशनल सेशन जज्ज, मेरट्, ह्यांच्या समोर ८ सप्टेंबर १९३१ रोजीं झाले.

माझे नांव गोविंद आहे, माझ्या बापाचें नांव रामचन्द्र आहे, माझी जात मराठा आहे व पेशा गिरणी कामगार. माझे घर मसुरे पोलीस स्टेशन मालवण, जिल्हा रत्नागिरी येथें आहे. मी मुंबईस रहातां.

प्रश्न:— सालच्या कोर्टातील तुमची जवानी P. 2606 ही १६-३-३१ रोजीं तुम्हांला वाचून दाखविली ती बरोबर आहे काय ?

उत्तर:— वाचून दाखविली ती बरोबर आहे.

प्रश्न:— ह्या सटल्यांतील तुमच्या विरुद्धचा पुरावा मुख्यतः दोन मध्यवर्तीं आहे. (१) कामकरी शेतकरी पक्ष व अखिल भारतीय कॅ. पक्ष. (२) ट्रेड युनियन व संपावढलचें कार्य. ह्या पुरावा पुढील प्रमाणें आहे. (१) P. 1353, 1343, 1344, 1373, (1), 942, 943, 945, 645, 1170 व P. W. 201 ची जवानी. (2) 958, 944, 959, 949, 1462, 966, 967, 954, 971, 662, 776, 932, 964 व P. W. 245, 273, 276 व 278 ह्या साक्षीदारांच्या साक्षी. शिवाय भाषण P. 1712, 1726, 1727, 1731, 173३ व 1734.

ही यादी मी तुम्हांला सुमारे दोन महिन्यांपूर्वी दिली होती. ह्या पुराव्याबद्दल तुम्हांला काहीं सांगावयाचें आहे काय ?

उत्तर:— ही यादी सुमारे दोन महिन्यांपूर्वी मला मिळाली होती. पण त्यासंबंधी सांगण्यापूर्वी माझ्या स्थितीबद्दल मला सांगावयाचें आहे. आमचा पूर्वीचा धंदा शेतीचा. मी पूर्वीचा शेतकरी पण परिस्थितीनें मला कामकरी केले. मी पकडला जाण्यापूर्वी सिंढेवस मिलमध्ये कपडे सात्यांत फिटरचें काम करीत होतों. मी गिरणीत १९०३ पासून काम केले आहे. मी पुस्तकें वाचून कामकऱ्यांची परिस्थिति सांगत नसें. स्वतः पंचवीस वर्षे अनुभवलेली व स्वतः कष्ट काढलेली सांगत आहे. मला माझेवर असलेल्या आरोपाचें क्षालन करण्याकरतां माझी व कामकऱ्यांची स्थिति सांगणें जरूर आहे. म्हणून मी माझ्यावर असलेल्या आरोपाविषयी सांगण्यापूर्वी सर्व हकीकत विदित करीत आहे. मी हायस्कूलांत अगर कॉलेजांत शिकलेला नाहीं. माझे मराठी दुसरीपर्यंत शिक्षण झालें आहे. त्यामुळे मला मराठीतील शुद्ध अशुद्ध कळत नाहीं. मला दुसरी कोणतीही भाषा येत नाहीं, असें मी केसला सुरवात झाल्याबरोबर कळवले आहे. त्यामुळे ह्या केसांतील पुष्कळशा गोष्टी कळणें अशक्य आहे. आम्ही पूर्वी शेतकी करीत होतों, हें मी वर सांगितलेंच आहे. आमची शेती फार लहान होती, ती आम्ही खंडानें करीत अशें; त्यामुळे जें पिके त्याचे तीन-चतुर्थांश खंडाकरतां म्हणून मालकास थावें लागे व उरलेल्या पिकांत आमच्या कुटुंबाचें भागणें अशक्य होतें. शेतीवर भागत नसल्यामुळे माझे वडील मी लहान असतांच मुंबईत गिरणीत नोकरी करतां आले, पण त्यांचाही पगार अपुरा असल्यामुळे त्यांत आमचा निवाह होत नसे. म्हणून माझे वडील बंधु बापाच्या मागून कांहीं वर्षांनीं मुंबईस नोकरीकरितां आले. त्याचें शिक्षणही मराठी तिसरीपर्यंत झालें होतें. मुंबईत आल्यावर ते तार ऑफिसमध्ये बॉय-प्यून म्हणून सात रुपये पगारावर नोकरीस राहिले. ते मुंबईत असतांना मी गांवीं होतों. मी गांवीं मराठी दुसरीपर्यंत शिक्षण घेतलें; पुढें आमचा घरखर्च अवघड होत गेल्यामुळे मलाही नोकरी घरणें लागू पडलें. घरीं हाळ होऊं लागले व माझ्या मातापितरांना फार त्रास होऊं लागला. म्हणूनच मी मुंबईस नोकरी करण्याचें ठरवें व वयाच्या अकराव्या वर्षी मी मुंबईत आलों. मुंबईत आल्यानंतर मी आद्रमजी परिभांय मिलमध्ये सन १९०३ मध्ये अर्ध्या पासावर कामास राहिलों. मला साडे तीन रुपये पगार मिळत असे. नोकरीवर राहिल्यामुळे माझ्या अभ्यासांत केव्हांही प्रगति अगर वाढ झाली नाहीं, माझ्या साडेतीन रुपये पगारांतून जाबर वगैरे लोकांना कांहींना कांहीं चंदा घ्यावी लागत असे. आम्हां जेर संबध आठवडा गैरहजर न राहिलों तर आम्हांस दोन आणे बक्षीस मिळत असत.

यदाकदाचित् आजारीपणामुळे किंवा इतर कारणामुळे एकाद्वे दिवशीं गैरहजर राहिलों तर मिळत असणारे दोन आणे व दबळ दिवस कापला जाई. त्यामुळे पगार पुष्कळच कमी येई. त्या कमी येणाऱ्या पगारांत माझ्यासारख्या गरीब कामगारांनीं काय करावें व पोटातरी कसे भरावें ही गोष्ट विचार करण्यासारखी आहे. आम्ही अर्ध्या पासावर काम करीत असल्यामुळे आम्हांस एक बिछा देण्यांत येत असे. तो बिछा आम्हांस गळ्यांत बांधावा लागे. त्या बिछ्यावरून आम्ही कोणत्या गिरणींत कोणत्या खात्यांत काम करतो हें समजे, व ह्या बिछ्यामुळे आम्ही कोणत्या मालकाचे गुलाम आहों, हें लोकांस कळे. गुलामाप्रमाणें वागण्याचें हें एक उदाहरणच आहे. वेळीं प्रसूर्गीं जर तो बिछा हरवला तर मात्र एक आणा दंड करण्यास मालक चुकत नसत. त्या वेळेस गिरण्या चौदा तास व दोन तास ओव्हर टाईम मिळून सोळा तास चालत (P. W. २०२ पहा). मी अर्ध्या पासावर असल्यामुळे सात तास काम करावें लागे. गिरणी सकाळीं पांच वाजतां चालू होई व त्यामुळे आम्ही कामकरी सकाळीं तीन वाजतां उठत असूं. नंतर चार साडेचार वाजेपर्यंत घरांतील सर्व कामें आटपून व घरांत असलेली चटणी भाकर खाऊन कामावर जाण्यास निघूं. संधंभ रस्ता अंधकारमय असल्यामुळे ठेंबाचळ अडसळत गिरणींत कामावर जात असूं. सकाळीं तीन वाजतां उठावें लागत असल्यामुळे आम्हांस कामकऱ्यांस पूर्णपणें झोंप मिळत नसे व झोंप व्यवस्थित न मिळाल्यामुळे आम्हांस कामगारांच्या प्रकृतीवर परिणाम होई. अशा तऱ्हेचें कष्ट काढीत मी एक वर्ष आदमजी पीरभांय मिलमध्ये काम केले. नंतर ती गिरणी जळली व त्यामुळे माझ्यासारख्या त्या गिरणींत काम करणाऱ्या सर्व लोकांवर अरिष्ट कोसळले व माझ्या साडेतीन रुपये मिळणाऱ्या नोकरीसही मी मुकलों. कांहीं दिवसांनंतर मी ग्रीव्हज् कॉटन मिलमध्ये अर्ध्या पासावर रुई खात्यांत कामास राहिलों. तेथें मला चार रुपये पगार मिळत असे. तेथें एक वर्ष काम केले. त्यानंतर त्या गिरणीला बारा रजा मालकांनीं जाहीर केल्या, त्याशिवाय सणासुदीच्याही रजा मिळतील असे सांगितले. मालकांनीं आमच्याकरितां ज्या सुससोई केल्या त्यापैकी एक ही होय. ही दया आम्हांस कशी भोवणार नाही! मुळांतच बारा दिवस रजा व सणाचे दोन तीन दिवस मिळून पंधरा दिवस रजा पडे त्यामुळे आमचे पंधरा दिवस भरत. गिरणींत पंधरा दिवसांचेंच काम असल्यामुळे आमच्या हातां दोन रुपयेच येत. बरें तो पगार तरी लौकर मिळेल? तेंही नाही. दोन रुपये पगार तोही दोन महिन्यांनंतर मिळे. चालू महिन्याचा म्हणजे सप्टेंबरचा पगार दोन महिन्यांनंतर नोव्हेंबरांत मिळे. यदाकदाचित् कामकरी आजारी होऊन घरी राहिला तर त्याचा पगार आणखी मागाहून वीस दिवस म्हणजे नोव्हेंबरच्या वीस तारखेला मिळत असे. ह्या सर्व कारणांमुळे आम्हांस कामकऱ्यांची फार गैरसोय होऊं लागली. एका महिन्यांत अशा पुष्कळशा रजा पडल्या असतां मी सात आणे नऊ पै पगार घेतला आहे. जर घरी माणूस मेलें व गिरणींत एखादें मनुष्य बोलावण्यास आलें तर त्या माणसाची व गिरण्यांतील माणसाची चिट होण्यास पंचाईत पडे; कदाचित् भेट झाली व त्यांनीं ती दुःसहायक बातमी ऐकून मॅनेजरकडे रजा मागावयास गेला तर रजा मिळत नसे. त्यामुळे घरी मरण पावलेल्या माणसाची व्यवस्था न होतां तो मनुष्य संध्याकाळीं घरी येईपर्यंत तें मयत मनुष्य तसेंच कुजत पडत असे, अशीं त्यावेळचीं आमचीं दुःखें असत. ह्या अडचणीची दाद लागवी म्हणून गिरणीतील कामकऱ्यांनीं कांहीं माणसें निवडून अडचणी मॅनेजरपुढें मांडण्याकरतां पाठवलीं. मॅनेजरपुढें मांडण्याचें कारण त्यावेळेस आम्हांस कामगारांना गिरणीचा मालक कोण हें माहीत नसे. मॅनेजर हाच गिरणीचा मालक व त्यामुळे तो करीत ती पूर्व दिशा हा आम्हांस कामगारांचा समज होता. मॅनेजरपुढें अडचणी मांडण्याकरतां गेलेल्या माणसांवर दयाळू मॅनेजरसाहेब चिडले व शिपायांकडून त्यांना बाहेर घालून दिले व लगेच नोटीस काढून गिरण बंद राहिली असे जाहीर केले. नंतर गिरण बंद झाल्यामुळे त्या गिरणींत काम करणाऱ्या सर्व माणसांना नोकरीस मुकावें लागले. नंतर मी क्रेसन्ट ऊर्फ दामोदर मिलमध्ये कामास राहिलों. त्यावेळेस मात्र मी संधंभ पासावर काम करीत होतो. मला साडेसात रुपये पगार मिळत होता. त्या गिरणींत मी भुयेर खात्यांत कामास होतो. त्या खात्याचें नांव काढले कीं अंगावर रोमांच उभे राहतात. खात्यांत काम करीत असतानां अंगावर, तोंडावर जिऊडे तिकडे कापूसच कापूस होऊन जातो. शिवाय अंगावर तेल उडून लहान लहान पुड्या येतात. अशा तऱ्हेच्या आरोग्यबाधक असलेल्या खात्यांत मी एकाच उद्देशानें कामास राहिलों. तो हेतु म्हणजे आमच्या कुटुंबास एखाद्या रुपयानें मदन व्हावी हा होय. त्याच गिरणींत माझे मामाही काम करीत होते. एके दिवशीं त्यांचा हात सांच्यांत सांपडला. व लगेच त्यांना हॉस्पिटलमध्ये नेण्यांत आले व तेथें त्यांचा हात कांपरपासून काढण्यांत आला. ते फक्त पंधरा दिवस हॉस्पिटलमध्ये होते.

बरे झाल्यावर गिरणींत आले व त्यांनीं हात गेल्याबद्दल कांहीं तरी मिळावें म्हणून मॅनेजरजवळ विनंति केली, पण मॅनेजरनीं ती जुमानली नाही. त्यांचा हात मोडण्यापूर्वी राहिलेला एक महिन्याचा पगार

व हॉस्पिटलमध्ये असतांनाचा पंधरा दिवसांचा पगार त्यांना दिला व तुमचा हात तुटल्यामुळे तुम्ही नीट काम करू शकणार नाही व तुमच्याने नीट कामही होणार नाही तरी तुम्ही यानंतर कामावर येऊ नये असे सांगण्यांत आले. ते मिळालेल्या पैशावर गावीं निघून गेले. ही स्थिति पाहून मी त्या गिरणीतून काम सोडले. नंतर एक दोन ठिकाणीं मी जाऊन सात्यांत काम केले नंतर मी रघुनाथ थोडा ऊर्फ बाँबे-इंडस्ट्रियल मिलमध्ये कपडे सात्यांत काम शिकण्यास राहिलों. कपडे सात्यांत काम शिकल्यानंतर मी त्याच गिरणीत कपडे सात्यांत काम करू लागलों. मी चार वर्षे त्या गिरणीत काम केले. नंतर त्याच गिरणीत फिटर्सचे काम शिकून कांहीं वर्षे फिटर्सचे काम केले. त्या वेळेस महायुद्ध सुरू झाल्यामुळे परदेशाचा माल हिंदुस्थानांत येण्याचे बंद झाले व त्यामुळे देशी वंदा तेजीस आला. इतर सर्व वस्तूंचा भाव वाढला पण कामकरी तसाच राहिला. त्याच्या पगारांत वाढ झाली नाही. महायुद्धांत मालकांस कोढों रुपयांचा नफा झाला, पण मालकांने कामकऱ्यास एक पै सुद्धा दिली नाही. महायुद्धांत सोल्यांचे भाडे वाढले, कपड्यांचा भाव वाढला, सर्व जिनसांचे भाव वाढले. कामकऱ्यास प्रगार तेवढाच होता व त्यामुळे तेवढ्या पगारांत त्यांचे भागणे शक्य नव्हते, म्हणून सन १९१७ मध्ये कामकऱ्यांनी संप पुकारला. संपाचे नेतृत्व सर नारायणराव चंदावरकर हायकोर्ट जज, रावसाहेब तालचेकर, आसवले, बोले, बाप्टिशा काका वगैरे लोकांकडे होते. त्या संपानंतर कामगारांच्या पगारांत कांहीं टके वाढ झाली. हा संप होण्याच्यापूर्वीपासून कामकऱ्यांत कोणी कशी चळवळ केली हे येथे थोडक्यांत सांगतो. कामकऱ्यांच्या चळवळीस पहिल्याने सुरवात कै. वा. नारायण मेघाजी लोसंडे यांनी केली, असे फुले यांच्या चरित्रावरून कळते. त्यानंतर १९०७ साली रा. सोटे थोडे बहुत कामकऱ्यांचे काम करीत होते. त्यांचे ऑफिसांत काळी चौकीवर लोकांच्या नोटीसा, अर्जे वगैरे लिहून देत असत. १९१७ चा संप करून पगारांत वाढ झाली. पारवून कामकऱ्यांच्या लक्षांत आले की, जर आपण सर्व कामकरी संघटित होऊं लागलों तर आपला फायदा होतो. १९१८ मध्ये एक संप व १९१९ मध्ये एक संप व १९२० मध्ये दोन संप झाले. त्यांचे नेतृत्व सर चंदावरकर, आसवले, तालचेकर, घागे मास्तर, बाळा मास्तर ऊर्फ नारायणराव कदम, जिनवाला, बॅरिस्टर पवार वगैरे पुढारी मंडळीकडे होते. १९१९ च्या संपांत फिक्स्ड पगारवाल्यांना कांहीं टके मिळाले व बेनसही मिळाले. १९२० च्या पहिल्या संपांत फिक्स्ड पगारवाल्यांना २० टके वाढ व अंगावर काम करणाऱ्यांच्या पगारांत २५ टके वाढ झाली. १९२० च्या दुसऱ्या संपांत फिक्स्ड पगारवाल्यांना आणखी पंधरा टके वाढ मिळाली व अंगावर काम करणाऱ्यांना १० टके वाढ मिळाली म्हणजे १९१७ सालापासून फिक्स्ड वाल्यांना ७० व अंगावर काम करणाऱ्यांना ८० टके वाढ झाली, कामकऱ्यांनी संप करून आपल्या पगारांत वाढ करून घेतली हे ह्यावरून समजेल. १९२० सालीच मी सेन्चरी मिल मध्ये नोकरीस होतो. त्या वर्षी मुंबईस ट्रेड युनियन कमिष झाली. आठवले (P. W. 191.) यांची माझी ओळख असल्यामुळे त्यांनी मला परिषदेत हजर राहण्याकरितां एक डेलिगेट तिकेट दिले व माझी प्रमाणे दुसऱ्या बऱ्याच कामगारांना तिकिटा दिल्या व परिषदेस हजर राहण्याबद्दल सांगितले. आम्ही प्रत्येक तिकिटाची आठ आणे फी दिली होती. त्या परिषदेचे अध्यक्ष लाला लजपतराय होते व दिवाण चमणलाल, झाबवाला, उमर सोबानी, तेरसी व इतर धोरधोर पुढारी हजर होते. कामगारांनाही परिषदेत बोलावल्यावरून आम्ही गेलो होतो (D. 50१) (अपूर्ण) 8-9-31

कासले (चारू)

सेंचरी मिलमध्ये मी काम करीत असतां एक दिवस आजारी पडलों त्यामुळे मला बंद केले. P. W. 191 ह्याने मला बरोबर चेऊन गिरणीत गेल्यावर इंग्रजीमध्ये त्यांनी म्यानेजरची बरोबर समजूत घातली. त्यावेळीं मला कामावर ठेवण्यांत आले. कामकऱ्यांना मारहाण व इतर कारणांनी गिरणीमध्ये कसा त्रास होतो ह्याबद्दल P. W. 191 ने सांगितले आहे. पॅसिफिकेशनने माझ्या वरती भयंकर कटाचा आरोप केला आहे. 121 पृ. कळमासालीं सरकारचे राज्य उलथून पाडण्याच्या कटाचा जो आरोप माझ्यावर केला आहे तो मला मान्य नाही. सरकारचे राज्य उलथून टाकण्याचा मी प्रयत्न केलेला नाही किंवा अशी माझी भावनाही नव्हती. किंवा मी कोणत्याही गुप्त कटाशी संबंध ठेवला नाही किंवा भाग घेतला नाही व अशा कटाचा मी मेंबरही झालों नाही. फक्त संपामध्येच मी भाग घेतला आहे. संपांत भाग घेण्याचे कारण मी गि. का. महामंडळाचा मेंबर होतो व गिरणी कामगार होतो व सार्वत्रिक संप झाल्यामुळे सर्व लोकांप्रमाणेच मलाही संपांत भाग घेणे जरूर होते. मी कम्युनिष्ट नाही किंवा कम्युनिष्ट मी समजत नाही. संपाच्या पूर्वी मी कोणत्याही राजकीय चळवळीत भाग घेतला नाही. किंवा संप करण्याकरतां उत्तेजन दिलेले नाही. कोणत्याही कटवाल्यांशी मी पत्रव्यवहार केलेला नाही व कोणत्याही गुप्त कटाशी माझा कांहींच संबंध नाही. मी कामगार असल्यामुळे ट्रेड युनियनच्या चळ-

वडीप्रमाणे काम करीत होती. तेव्हा माझ्यावर जो कटाचा आरोप केला आहे तो मला कबूल नाही. आतां मी १९२१ साली ज्या मिल्पीती काम करीत होतो तिची थोडीशी हकीकत सांगतो. १९२१ पासून मी सिम्प्लेक्स मिलमध्ये काम करीत होतो. सन १९२३ मध्ये बोनास बंद केल्यामुळे सार्वत्रिक संप झाला, संपाची कारणे मी येथे देत आहे. सन १९२३ सालीच गि. का. महामंडळ स्थापन झाले, त्याची हकीकत पुढे देईन. कामगारांना बोनास मिळण्याकरतां एक वर्षभर एकही दिवस साडा न करतां मरावे लागत असे. जर तो कांहीं दिवस घरी राहिला तर त्याची ती बोनास काढून घेण्यांत येत असे. अशा प्रकारच्या कामगारांच्या अनेक अडचणीविषयी मी मागे सांगितलेच आहे. बोनाससंबंधाने जो संप झाला तो खुद्द मालकांनीच करविला. अकरा महिने भरल्यावर मालकांनी आम्हांस तोटा होत आहे, बोनास देण्यास आम्हांस शक्य नाही अशी ओरड केली. अकरा महिने काम करून ज्यावेळी बोनास घेण्यास जावे त्यावेळी मालकांनी आम्हांस बोनास देतां येत नाही असे सांगितले. बोनास मिळण्याकरतां कामगार संपावर गेले. त्या संपाचे नेतृत्व गि. का. महामंडळांतली सन १९२३ सालचे अध्यक्ष भटवाडकर, आळवे, एन. एम. जोशी, मयेकर, रा. व. आसवळे, अनंरती मेन्डिस, रा. रा. एस्. के. बोले, शाबवाला, जिनवाला, सय्यद मुनावर वगैरे मंडळींकडे होते. ह्याविषयी बहुतेक हकीकत आळवे यांनी सांगितलीच आहे. मला जास्त सांगण्याची जरूरी नाही. आतां गि. का. महामंडळाविषयी मला सांगणे जरूर आहे. गि. का. महामंडळ ही संस्था १९२३ च्या डिसेंबर महिन्यांत डिहाईल रोडवर असलेल्या बाच्छा बिल्डिंगमध्ये तिसऱ्या मजल्यावरील गौळरीत स्थापन झाली. गि. का. महामंडळ स्थापन करण्याचा विचार झाला तेव्हा दत्तात्रेय आत्माराम भटवाडकर, दत्तात्रय रामचंद्र मयेकर, रा. व. आळवे, मारुती आलव, तावडे, साधळकर, परुळेकर, शंकर धाकू कुसगांवकर, महादेव परब व इतर कामगार हे हजर होते. मी त्यांच्या बाजूच्या अबू बिल्डिंगमध्ये रहात होतो. त्यावेळी मी पण तेथे हजर होतो. आपल्या कामगारांमध्ये एखादी संस्था असावी असा तेथे निश्चय ठरला, त्याचवेळेस गि. का. महामंडळ ही संस्था जन्मास आली. मंडळाचे ऑफिस चिंचपोकळी आर्थर रोडवर असलेल्या हेजीबच्या चाळांत पहिल्या मजल्यावर सोली नंबर १० घेण्याचे ठरले. ऑफिसची सोली भटवाडकर यांच्या नावे घेण्याचे ठरले. मेबरची वर्गीणी वार्षिक सव्वा रुपया देण्यांत आली व त्याच वेळेस मंडळाचे अधिकारी निवडण्यांत आले. त्यावेळी असे ठरले की, कामगारांखेरीज गि. का. महामंडळांमध्ये दुसरे बाहेरचे लोक कोणी घेऊं नयेत. अध्यक्ष भटवाडकर साक्षात्कार जाबर मोती मिल, सेक्रेटरी साधळकर, नंतर परुळेकर हेड टाईम कीपर नारायण मिल, सजिनदार कुसगांवकर, वीव्हिंग जाबर कस्तुरचंद्र मिल नंबर १३, कमिटी मेम्बर्स दत्तात्रेय रामचंद्र मयेकर, वासुदेव कृष्ण परब, असिस्टंट टाईम कीपर सिंलेक्स मिल, रा. व. आळवे वीव्हिंग डिपार्टमेंट काऊन मिल, मारुती आलव विल्डिंग डिप्ट. काऊन मिल, श्रीराम कान्होजी तावडे प्लानेट मिल टाईम कामगार, महादेव परब असिस्टंट टाईम कीपर जमशेट मिल, त्याप्रमाणे मी एक मेबर होतो (विल्डिंग फिटर गोविंद रामचंद्र कासले, सिंलेक्स मिल) त्याशिवाय इतर कांहीं मंडळींचीं नांवे होती. कांहीं वर्षांनी भटवाडकर व मयेकर यांच्यांत तंटा उत्पन्न झाला, त्यामुळे मयेकर यांनी गि. का. महामंडळ एक नंबरची शाखा प्रभादेवी येथे मारुती आलव यांच्या शेजारी टेक्स्टाईल मिलजवळ उघडली. ही शाखा उघडण्याचा समारंभ १९२५ च्या आगष्ट महिन्याच्या पहिल्या तारखेस झाला. त्यांत त्या शाखेचे अधिकारी मंडळ निवडण्यांत आले ते असे:—अध्यक्ष अ. आ. आळवे, जनरल सेक्रेटरी द. रा. मयेकर, सजिनदार बी. टी. आळवे व मॅनेजिंग कमिटीत माझेही नांव होते. (D. 420) मारुती आलव हे ऑफिसवर देखरेख ठेवीत. तर आम्ही सर्वत्र लोक कामगार जाणारे होतो, तेव्हा मला घडी घडी मंडळांत जायला होत नसे. एक दोन महिन्यांनी केव्हा गेलो तर गेलो. सभासद वाढविण्याचे पुष्कळसे कार्य बाबा काळसेकर यांनी केले. तावडे हे मराठी लिहिण्याचे काम करीत असत व ते त्यावेळी मंडळाचे असिस्टंट सेक्रेटरी होते.

आतां १९२५ सालच्या संपाची माहिती सांगतो. १९२३ च्या संपांत बोनास कापून मालकांनी आमच्यावर मोठी दया केली व मालकांचा अनोनात फायदा होत असतां मुद्दा आम्हांला तोटा होत आहे असे म्हणून मूळ पगारांत म्हणजे काम केलेल्या पगारांत ११३ टक्के १९२५ साली कापण्याचे ठरविले त्याविषयी हकीकत आळवे यांनी सांगितलीच आहे. ज्यावेळी मालकांनी हे टक्के कापण्याचा प्रयत्न केला, तेव्हा लोक संपावर गेले, तो संप ७३ दिवस चालला. त्या संपातही संयुक्तसंप कमिटी होती. त्या कमिटीचे अध्यक्ष एन. एम. जोशी व सभासद श्रीयुत अ. आ. आळवे, मयेकर, तावडे, आसवळे, बोले, शाबवाला, जिनवाला व इतर कामगारी होते. ह्या संपांत विलायतच्या कामगार बंधूंनी आम्हांला पंचवीस हजार रुपयांची मदत केली होती. त्याशिवाय आसवळे यांनी मुंबई म्युनिसिपल कॉर्पोरेशनमध्ये एक लाख रुपये कामकर्यांस मदत करावी असा ठराव आणला तो पासही झाला. तितक्या रुपयांचे कांहीं

तरी काम कामकऱ्यांकडून करून घ्यायें असें ठरलें. ७३ दिवस संप टिकण्यानंतर कामगारांची चिकिती पाहून व आम्ही पगार कापून कामावर जाणार नाहीं असा त्यांचा निश्चय पाहून मालकांना पगारकाट्याची नोटीस मागे घ्यावी लागली. त्या संपात कामकऱ्यांचा विजय झाला. सन १९२६ सालीं विद्यार्थ्यांच्या कामगारचर्चुचा संप झाला होता. म्हणून त्यांना मदत करण्याकरितां प्रभा देवीच्या शोकेतफें एक सभा बोलावण्यात आली. तिचे अध्यक्ष अँडेव्हेकेट आर्नदराव सुबे हे होते. ती सभा कामगार बँदूची स्थिति समजावून सांगते वेळीं असें सांगितलें कीं, तेही आम्हांपैकीं एका कामगार बँदूच्या स्थानांनीं आपल्या संपात आम्हाला मदत केली आहे व आमच्याविषयीं सहाय्युत्तित दाखविली आहे. वगैरे वगैरे गोष्टी सांगून त्यांना मदत करण्याविषयीं उपदेश केला व अध्यक्ष ह्यांनीं स्वतः पांच रुपये दिले. काहीं दुसरी मंडळी एजर होती त्यांनींही मदत केली व शाळेंतील लहान लहान मुले होती त्यांनींही थोडी थोडी मदत केली. त्यावेळीं माझा मुलगा भास्कर ह्यानें आपल्या साज मधून एक रुपया दिला होता. अशा तऱ्हेनें आम्ही त्यांना १२१ रुपये पहिला हप्ता म्हणून पाठवले. हा कार्यक्रम आटोपल्यावर कांहीं महिन्यांनीं विद्यार्थ्यांकडून आलेले ट्रेड युनियनचे एक कार्यकर्ते हांचे स्वागत करण्याची वेळ आली. ती सभा नागू ख्याजीच्या वाढवित झाली. ते विद्यार्थ्यांतील एक मोठे सद्गुरुस्थ, ट्रेड युनियनचे अधिकारी व कामगारांचे हितकर्ते आहेत असें दत्तात्रय सयेकर वगैरे मंडळांनीं आम्हांला सांगितलें. त्यावेळीं त्यांचें मंडळातफें आम्ही मोठ्या घाटानें स्वागत केलें. त्या सभेकरितां कांहीं लोकांजवळून सामान वगैरे मागून समाधि पार पडला.

सन १९२६ पर्यंत बावीस वर्षे मी काम करित असल्यामुळे कामगारांची स्थिति मला साहेत झाली. त्यांची रहाण्याची व्यवस्था, त्यांच्या दुःखाचीं अहचणीचीं कारणांही मला पुष्कळशीं समजलीं, तीं येथें नमूद करणें जरूर आहे. कामगार कामावर राहण्यापूर्वी कसा लुबाडला जातो, हे प्रथम सांगतों, कामावर राहण्यापूर्वी कामकऱ्यास एकाचा जाबरची ओळख करावी लागते व ज्या स्वाच्यांत मागसें काम करतात त्यांच्यावर जाबर मुख्य असतो, असें म्हणण्यास हरकत नाही. कामावर वेवण्याकरितां पहिल्या प्रथम त्याला कांहीं तरी विरी मिरी थावी लागते. रोज संध्याकाळीं एक फेरी तरी नोकरीकरतां त्याच्या घरीं बालावी लागते. प्रत्येक वेळेला रुपया आठ आणे त्या विचाऱ्याला सवें आहेच. कामावर राहण्यापूर्वी सुद्धां कामगार अस्मानादीनें लुबाडला जातो. जाबर व इतर वरिष्ठ अधिकारी ह्यांविषयीं मी थोडीशी हकीकत येथें निवेदन करतो. एकादा कामगार राहिल्यानंतर त्याला जाबर, हेड जाबर, कटछेकर, फोडिंग जाबर, नंबर मार्कर आणि असिस्टंट फोडिंग मास्टर, हेड वीडिंग मास्टर व मॅनेजर जे सांगतील ते झडून पाळावे लागतात. व ते झडून कदाचित् अमान्य झाले तर त्या वरिष्ठ अधिकऱ्यांचा रोष आम्हां कामगारांवर होतो. नंतरं छुडझुडा कारणावरून काढून टाकण्यांत येत. तैशिविवाय अनेक प्रकारचे दंडही होतात. फणी तुटली कीं दंड होतो, कुवा मोडला कीं दंड होतो, कपड्यास करटो टारपोल तुटलें कीं दंड होतो, पिकास तुटली कां दंड होतो. कपड्यास करटो पडली कीं दंड होतो, एकादी तार किंवा दुसरा डोंग कपड्यावर पडल्यास तो कपडा अंगावर पडतो व त्या कपड्याची किंमत कामकऱ्यास भावी लागते. कपड्याची किंमत भरल्याशिवाय पगार मिळत नाहीं. ह्या कपड्याची किंमत एकादे वेळीं पगारापेक्षाही जास्त होते, कपड्याची किंमत भरण्याकरितां त्याला कर्ज काढावें लागते. ते कर्ज काढण्याकरतां जाबर किंवा हेड जाबर किंवा एकादा वाणी किंवा मारवाही नाहीं तर राक्षण हांची पायधरणी करावी लागते. आणि जर विशेष प्रसंगीं कांहीं कारणास्तव त्या कामकऱ्याचा सांजु मोडला तर एकेक महिना विचाऱ्या कामगाराला विन पगाराशिवाय घरीं बसावें लागतें. त्याचा पगार त्याला मिळत नाही. एखादे वेळेस कामगारी आजारी पडून घरीं राहिला तर कपडेसात्यांत त्यास रोकडवृत्ती म्हणजे गॅकडू पैसे भरणे लागतात; जर ती बदली भरली नाहीं तर त्यास घरीं पाठविण्यांत येतें व तीन चार दिवसांत जर बदली भरली नाहीं तर कामावरून कमी करण्यांत येतें. नोकरी राहण्याकरतां व बदली भरण्याकरतां त्यास जाबरची हांजी हांजी करावी लागते. व नंतर तो जाबर, वाणी, मारवाड्याचे पैसे एकादे वेळीं काढून देतो. पण त्यांत जाबरची कांहींनाकांहीं भागी आहेच. दुसरे दिवशीं विचारा जाऊन बदली भरते. पगाराचे दिवशीं कामकऱ्याचा पगार दोन तीन दिवस घरी असल्यावर कमीच येतो, तरी त्या पगारांत राहू केतु असतातच. एकादे वेळीं मॅनेजराच्या मुलाचे लग्न असले कीं एकपण रुपया वगैरी काढतात; पण त्या मॅनेजराच्या मुलाच्या किंवा मुलीच्या लग्नाशीं कामकऱ्याचा वास्तविक कांहीं संबंध नसतो, पण असिस्टंट वीडिंग मास्तर, हेड जाबर, व इतर अधिकारी तो आणतात व कामकऱ्यांकडून वगैरी काढतात व ते लग्न सजवण्याकरितां कांहीं पैसे सवें करतात व बाकीचे

आपल्या शिक्षांत ओतातात. त्याचप्रमाणे श्रीसत्यनारायणाची गिरणींत पूजा करतात. ती पूजा शंभर शूडशें रुपयांत सहज होऊं शकते, पण कामकऱ्यांकडून वर्गणी काढून हजार रुपये गोळा करितात. त्यापैकी सात आठशें रुपये वरिष्ठ अधिकार्यांकरतां खर्च करतात. कामकऱ्यांवर नाटकांचीं व तमाशांचीं तिकिटें त्यांचे वरिष्ठ अधिकारी लादतात. नाटकांचीं व तमाशांचीं कॉन्ट्रॅक्टें बहुधा हेच गिरण्यांतील अधिकारी घेत असतात. बिचाऱ्या कामकऱ्यांना जबर-दस्तीनें गळ्यांत बांधल्यामुळे हीं तिकिटें घेणें भाग पडतें. जर एखादेवेळीं त्यानें तिकिटें घेतलीं नाहीत तर वरिष्ठ अधिकार्याचा त्या कामगारावर शोध होऊन त्याला थोडक्याच दिवसांत नोकरीस मुकाबें लागतें. त्याचप्रमाणे हेड जाबरपासून मॅनेजरपर्यंत कोणीतरी चाळीस किंवा पन्नास रुपयांचें घड्याळ आणतो व एखादी बाजाची पेटी मोडकी तोडकी आणतो व त्याच्यावर सोरट काढितात. व त्याच्यावर सात आठशें रुपये उत्पन्न करतात व ती वर्गणी बिचाऱ्या कामगारावर चार चार आण्यांप्रमाणें लादतातात. ह्या सर्व कारणांमुळे पगार कमी येतो. म्हणून त्या बिचाऱ्या गरीब कामगाराला कर्ज काढून व्यवस्था करावी लागते. आणि घराचा कारभार चालवावा लागतो. अंगावर कपडा पडला कीं त्याची किंमत भरावी लागते. ती भरण्याकरितां त्याला वाणी, मारवाडी किंवा पठाण यांचें कर्ज काढावें लागतें. पठाण एका रुपयास चार आणे पासून सहा आणे पर्यंत व्याज घेतात. दहा रुपयांच्या ऐवजीं बीस रुपये लिहून घेतात. त्या बिचाऱ्याला सही येत नसेल तर त्याचा आंगठा घेतात व कागदावर मात्र १ आणा व्याज लिहितात. जर एखादेवेळीं पगाराचे दिवशीं दिवस साढा झाल्यामुळे कामगाराचा पगार मिळाला नाही तर तो पठाण दुंदुका घेऊन त्या कामकऱ्याच्या घरीं दरवाजावर उभाच असतो व अचकट बिचकट भाषा वापरतो. व वेळीं प्रसंगीं मारण्यासही तो मागे पुढें पहात नाही. जाबर किंवा हेड जाबरचें कर्ज असल्यास तो कामगाराचा पगार गिरणींतच काढून घेतो. हेड जाबर किंवा जाबरनें पगार घेतल्यामुळे तो कामकरी तसाच हात हाळवीत घरीं येतो. जर पगाराचे पैसे थावयाचे असते तर मग, त्याच्या जन्माची स्थिति विचारून नका व पठाण संव्याकाळीं त्याच्या दरवाज्यावर दंडा घेऊन उभा राहातो, हा बिचारा कामकरी त्याच्या-जवळ पैसे नसल्यामुळे रात्रीं नऊ नऊ दहा दहा वाजेपर्यंत त्या पठाणाला भिऊन बाहेर राहतो. दुसऱ्या दिवशीं जांभर किंवा हेड जांभरच्या घरीं तो कामकरी जाऊन आदल्या दिवशीं घेतलेला पगार पुनः परत उसने देण्याविषयीं याचना करतो. व जांभर किंवा हेड जांभर स्वतःचे अगर दुसऱ्या जवळून पैसे काढून त्याला देतो व घेतल्यापेक्षां दुप्पट रकम लिहून थावी लागते, नंतर तो दुसऱ्या मंडळीची देण्याची व्यवस्था करतो. एखाद्या कामगाराला मारवाड्याजवळून पैसे काढण्याचा प्रसंग आल्यास तो मारवाडी दबल पैसे लिहून तर घेतोच, कागदाचे आठ आणेही घेतोच, व्याज पहिलें कांपून घेतो आणि एखादे वेळीं दोन तीन महिने पैसे राहिल्यास एक महिन्या ऐवजीं 'शिमागा, फाल्गून आणि होळी' म्हणून एक महिन्या-ऐवजीं तीन महिन्यांचें व्याज एकदम घेतो. अशा प्रकारें अनेक अडचणी आम्हां कामगारांवर गुदरलेल्या असतात. (अपूर्ण) 9-9-31

कासले (चाळ)

कामकरी स्त्रिया व त्यांना होत असलेला त्रास.

गिरणींत रहाट(रीडींग)व वाईद्विंभ सात्यांत स्त्रियाही काम करतात. कामावर राहण्याकरितां त्यांना नायकिणीस एक दोन रुपये थावे लागतात. त्यानंतर ती कामावर ठेवते. कामावर राहिल्यावर ती सांगेल त्या आज्ञा पाळ्या लागतात. न केल्यास झुलकशा कारणावरून काढून टाकते. पगाराच्या दिवशीं तिला आठ आण्यांपासून रुपया दोन रुपयांपर्यंत दस्तुती द्यावी लागते. गिरणींत त्या बायांना जास्त माळ (सूत, धागा वगैरे) मिळावा म्हणून तिला एक दोन रुपये जास्त थावे लागतात. सणा-सुदीच्या दिवशीं तिला घरांत काय केले असेल त्यांतील थोडासा भाग थावा लागतो; अशा तऱ्हेचा पुष्कळ त्रास कामगार स्त्रियांस गिरणींत होतो.

कामगार रहात असलेली जागा.

जेकब सर्कलपासून नागू सयाजीचे वाडीपर्यंत बहुतेक कामगार वस्ती जास्त आहे. गिहकटो-रिया गार्डनपासून तों शिवडीपर्यंत तेथून नागू सयाजीची वाडी, बरळी, प्रभादेवी, फर्ग्युसन रोड, डिला-ईल रोड, व चिंचपोकली एवढ्या भागांत कामकरी वर्ग राहतो. ह्या भागांत रस्ता पाहिला तर रात्रंदिवस धुरळा एकसारखा नाकातोंडांत जात असतो. कामकऱ्यांच्या चाळी गुरांच्या कोंढवाड्यापेक्षांही गळिच्छ असतात. ज्या काही चाळींना मजळे आहेत त्या प्रत्येक मजल्यावर बीसपासून तीस पर्यंत सोल्या असतात. सोळी पांच किंवा सात फूट रुंद व सात फूट लांब असते. प्रत्येक चाळीला तीन किंवा चार

संदास असतात. एक किंवा दोन नळ असतात. संदास इतके घाणेरडे असतात की, त्यांत बसण्याची इच्छा होत नाही. कामकऱ्यास सकाळीं कामावर जावें लागतें त्यामुळे इतकी घांढ होते की संदासाळा जाण्यास पाणी मिळालें तर संदास मिळोवयाचा नाही, व संदास असला तर पाणी मिळोवयाचें नाही. अशा प्रकारच्या अनेक अडचणींना आम्हां कामगऱ्यांना तोंड धावें लागतें. तेथल्या लहान सोल्यांचें मांडें ८ किंवा ९ रुपये असल्यामुळे एकपेक्षा जास्त सोल्या घेण्यास कामकऱ्यांना फार जड आतें. ज्या चाळीला मजले नसतात त्यांत तर फारच गैरसोय असते. त्या चाळी दोन्ही बाजूला असतात व मध्यें जागा मोकळी असते. हुतफा चाळी असल्यामुळे म्युनिसिपालिटीनें नळांतील घाणपाणी बाहेर काढण्याकरतां सोल्यांच्याच बाजूनें गटारें काढलीं असल्यामुळे हवा फार दूषित होते. पावसाच्या दिवसांत तर सोल्यांत पाणी सांचतें, त्यामुळे ताप वगैरे रोग होऊन कामकरी आजारी पडतात. चाळीतून सदासर्वकाळ अंधार असतो. सूर्यप्रकाश तर पुष्कळशा चाळीतून दिसत नाही. चाळींत तर शुद्ध हवा मिळणें अशक्यच. कारण आसपास गिरण्या असल्यामुळे बारीक बारीक कण नेहमीं हवेंत मिसळतात. त्याशिवाय सूर्यप्रकाश नसल्यामुळे पाण्यानें चिसळांत घाण पैदा होते. ती नाहीशी होत नाही. शुद्ध हवा व सूर्यप्रकाश नसल्यामुळे कामगारांच्या प्रकृतीवर परिणाम होतो व ते आजारी पडतात. कामकऱ्यांच्या सोल्या व चाळी सदा काळ्या असतात. वर्षातून एकदां मालकांच्या मनांत आलें तर तो त्यांना रंग देतो. एवढ्या गलिच्छ सोल्या, चाळी व पाण्याचा त्रास, संदासाचा त्रास, हवेचा त्रास अशा अनेक अडचणींमुळे आम्हां कामगारांवर 'सिक' पडण्याचा प्रसंग येतो. कामकऱ्यांकरतां सिमिटाच्या चाळी बांधण्यांत आल्या आहेत त्या बरळी, डिहाईट रोड, नायगांव ह्या ठिकाणीं आहेत. व्हिडाईल रोड व नायगांव ह्या ठिकाणांच्या चाळींत साधारण माणसें राहतात. पण वळीच्या सिमिटाच्या सर्व्हे चाळी जवळ जवळ सगळीं आहेत. कारण त्या ठिकाणीं हेमेशा रोग उत्पन्न होतो, त्याच चाळींत हिंडू-मुसलमानांच्या दर्यांत माणसें पकडून ठेवण्याकरितां त्यांचा तुलंग बनवला होता. सोल्या लहान असतात. पण माणसें आठ किंवा नऊ राहतात. त्यांना शोषण्यास ती जागा अपुरी असते. अशा प्रकारच्या अनेक अडचणी आमच्यावर आलेल्या आहेत.

सन १९२५ सालच्या संपानंतर कामकऱ्यांवरील जुलूम.

सन १९२५ च्या संपांत कामकऱ्यांचा विजय झाल्यामुळे मालकांना वाईट वाटलें होतें असे म्हणण्यास हरकत नाही. व कोणत्याही तऱ्हेनें कामकऱ्यांस जेरीस आणावयाचें असें त्यांनीं ठरविलें असल्याचें त्यांच्या पुढील घोरणावरून नव्हे, वागणुकीवरून दिसून येतें. संप संपल्यावर थोडे दिवस मालक गप्प बसले होते. जर त्यांनीं गोंधळ केला असता तर त्यांचा गोंधळ कामकऱ्यांनीं लगेच बंद केला असता. पण मालक घोर पाणी म्हाणून त्यांनीं तसें केलें नाही. कांहीं दिवस लोटल्यानंतर त्यांनीं कामकऱ्यांवर जुलूम करण्यास सुरुवात केली. हा जो जुलूम झाला त्याबद्दल मीच माझा अनुभव देतो. मी सिम्प्लेक्स मिलमध्ये कपडे सात्यांत फिटरचें काम करीत होतो (D 503) त्या सात्यांत एकंदर नऊ फिटर व चार बिगारी होते. त्यांपैकी पांच फिटर व चार बिगारी ह्यांना कमी करण्यांत आलें. त्यामुळे त्यांचें काम आम्हां चौघांसच करावें लागे पण पगारांत मात्र वाढ करण्यांत आली नाही. फिटर लोक आठ वाजतां कामावर येत व साडे पांच वाजतां सुटत, पण त्या एवजीं त्यांनीं सकाळीं सात वाजतां कामावर यावें व संध्याकाळीं सहाला सुटावें असें करण्यांत आलें. ओव्हर टाईम मिळत असे तेंही बंद करण्यांत आलें. काम वाढलें, टाईम वाढला व पगारांत मात्र एका पैचीही वाढ करण्यांत आली नाही. हें समजण्यासाठीं मुंबई मिल वर्कर्स युनियनचें मासिक 15-11-28 पान नं. ४ कॉलम नं. १-४४ D 435 (2) पहा.

सिम्प्लेक्स मिलमध्ये असतें वेळीं माझी बहीण घरीं घृत्यु पावली म्हणून मला बोलावणें आलें. ही गोष्ट मीं मॅनेजरला सांगितली. पण त्यांनीं रजा दिली नाही. एवढेंच नव्हे तर तुमच्याकडेच माणसें कां भरतात, आमच्याकडे कां भरत नाहीत असा जबाब केला. गिरण सुटल्यावर मी घरीं गेलों व नंतर तिचा दहनविधि केला. शास्त्रामार्गे जाळलेल्या माणसाची रक्षा दुसऱ्या दिवशीं समुद्रांत टाकानी लागते त्यासाठीं मला जावें लागलें व त्या दिवशीं मी कामावर जाऊं शकलों नाहीं. व शेजारीं रहात असलेल्या असिस्टंट टाईमकीपरबरोबर निरोप पाठविला कीं, मी आज कामावर येऊं शकत नाहीं, माझ्या बहिणीची सर्व्हे हकीकत आपल्याला माहीत आहे, ती मॅनेजरला सांगावी. दुसऱ्या दिवशीं मी कामावर गेलों पण मॅनेजरनें माझे दोन दिवस कापले. एक दिवस काम केलेला व एक गैरहजर राहिलेला. कामावर जाते वेळीं म्युनिसिपालिटीचा घृत्युपास मी बरोबर नेला होता, पण मॅनेजरनें त्याची पर्वा केली नाही. १९२५ सालच्या संपानंतर मालक एक स्कीम तयार करीत होते. ती स्कीम तयार करण्यांत मालकांनीं जवळ जवळ एक दोन वर्षे घालविलीं असावीं. ती तयार झाल्यानंतर अमलांत आणण्याला सुरुवात

केली. तिला तीन सांचे दोन बाजूंची पद्धत असें ह्मणतात. दोन सांच्यांवर एक माणूस काम करितो. त्याच्या गळ्यांत तीन सांचे बांधण्यांत यावे, म्हणजे तीन माणुस जें काम करित तें दोघांकडून करून घेणें. एक बाजूवर एक माणूस काम करतो त्याला दोन बाजूची काम करावयास लावणें व एकास कामावरून कमी करणें. अशा तऱ्हेनें माणुसें कमी करवून टाईम वाढवून तेवढ्याच पगारांत काम करून घेण्याची पद्धत चालू करण्यास सुरुवात केली. ही पद्धत ससून व फिन्ले यांनीं चालू करण्याचें उरविलें असावें. कारण पहिल्यानें ही पद्धत त्यांच्याच गिरणींत सुरू झाली, त्यामुळे त्या गिरण्या संपावर गेल्या. अपोलो मिल १९२७ च्या जानेवारींत बाहेर पडली. त्याच गिरणीमध्ये ही पद्धत चालू झाली होती. नंतर ससून व फिन्लेमध्ये संप झाला. कामकरी संपावर गेल्यामुळे मालकांनीं ही पद्धत बंद ठेवतों असें सांगितलें, नंतर माणुसें कामावर जाऊं लागली. मालकांनीं त्या कामगारांमध्ये फूट पाडली व पुनः त्याच गिरणींत ती पद्धत चालू केली. नंतर बऱ्याचशा गिरण्यांत ही पद्धत चालू केल्यावर पंधरा वीस हजार माणुसें बेकार झालीं. अशा तऱ्हेची परिस्थिति असतां गि. का. महामंडळांत श्री. मयेकर व एक्सिक्युटिव्ह कमिटी यांत तंडा उत्पन्न झाला. त्या बाबतींत लोकांना कळण्याकरतां जुलाभेवार हॅन्डबिल अध्याक्ष ए. ए. आळवे ह्यांनीं एक्सिक्युटिव्ह कमिटीच्या नांवानें काढलें. हें हॅन्डबिल प्रॉसिक्यूशनतर्फें पुराख्यांत घालण्यांत आलें आहे. (P. 1462) ह्या बाबतींत मी खालीलप्रमाणें जुलासा करतों. गि. का. महामंडळाच्या एक्सिक्युटिव्ह कमिटीचा मी सभासद होतो, पण मी कामावर असल्यामुळे व घरच्या अडचणीमुळे ए. कमिटीच्या प्रत्येक मिटींगला जात नसें. त्यामुळे मंडळाच्या सर्व हकीकती समजणें शक्य नव्हतें. श्री. मयेकर ह्यांनीं हिशोबांत गोंधळ केला आहे असा संशय ए. कमिटीला आला. व त्या बाबतींत हे हिशेब तपासण्याकरतां एक कमिटी नेमण्यांत आली. त्या कमिटींत श्री. मयेकर यांनीं थोडासा हिशेबही दिला. त्यावरून सर्व झालेल्या पैशाचा व त्या हिशोबाचा मेळ बसेना. ही गोष्ट कमिटीच्या लक्षांत आली. त्याशिवाय वर्गणी गोळा करून लोकांनीं दिलेले पैसे श्री. मयेकर यांनीं लिखांत घातले. हे पैसे घेऊन पावती श्री. मयेकर यांनीं दिलेली होती पण त्या पैशाचा हिशोब मात्र कमिटीस दाखविला नव्हता. अशा प्रकारची अफरातफर कमिटीस दिसली व ही सर्व हकीकत हिशेब तपासण्याकरतां नेमलेल्या कमिटीनें ए. कमिटीच्या पुढे सादर केली. ए. कमिटीनें परत तो सर्व हिशेब तपासला व त्यांत गोंधळ आहे असें जेव्हां दिसून आलें तेव्हां श्री. मयेकर ह्यांनीं आम्हां गरीब कामगार लोकांना फसविलें व आम्हां कामगार लोकांनीं वर्गणीरूपानें महामंडळांत जमवलेला पैसा उघडला आहे; तेव्हां ही गोष्ट लोकांपुढें मांडलीच पाहिजे असें उरविलें. तें हॅन्डबिल गि. का. महामंडळाचे अध्यक्ष श्री. आळवे ह्यांना काढण्याचा अधिकार ए. कमिटीनें दिला होता. हें हॅन्डबिल प्रॉसिक्यूशनतर्फें कां घालण्यांत आलें तें समजत नाही; कारण दगाबाजी करणाऱ्या माणसास किंग लोकांपुढें मांडणें हें आमचें कर्तव्य आहे. सर्व पैसा मारिबांनीं चार चार आणे वर्गणी करून महामंडळांत सांचवला होता. त्याचा मयेकर यांनीं वाटेल तसा दुरुपयोग केला आहे असें कमिटीनें सिद्ध करून दाखविलें असतां त्यावर पांघरूण घालणें म्हणजे कामकऱ्यांशीं हारामखोरी करण्यासारसें होईल. अशा प्रकारचा धांगडपिंगा मयेकरांनीं केल्यामुळे त्यांना महामंडळांतून काढण्यांत आले. P. 1463 पहा. P. 1462 ह्या हॅन्डबिलावर माझी सही आहे किंवा नाही हें हातीं लिहिलेले हॅन्डबिल पाहिल्याखेरीज मला सांगतां येणार नाही. ए. कमिटीचा मी मेंबर असल्यामुळे माझें नांव घातलें असावें.

१९२८ च्या संपास झालेलीं कारणें.

तीन सांचे दोन बाजू चालल्यामुळे जवळ जवळ पंधरा वीस हजार लोक नैकार झाले होते. पगारांत पंधरा ते वीस टक्के काट करण्यांत आली. टाईम वाढवला होता. छुट्टाकारणावरून मयंकर दंड करण्यांत येत असे. गिरणीमध्ये लांच लागण्याचा प्रकार जोरांत वाढला होता. बारीक सारीक कारणांवरून कामकऱ्यांना कमी करण्यांत येऊं लागलें होतें. गिरणींत सुलतानशाही चालली होती. ह्या सर्व कारणांमुळे कामकरी त्रासला होता. मीही फार त्रासलों होतो, कारण थोड्या पगारांत आठ माणसांचें पोट कसें भरावें, कर्ज कसें फेडावें, खोलीमांडें कसें यावें, मुळाकडून शाळेंतीत फी कशी भरावी, त्यांना शिक्षण कसें यावे व इतर व्यावहारिक गोष्टी कशा कराव्यात, ह्या सर्व गोष्टी करणें मला व माझ्याप्रमाणें दुसऱ्या कामगारांनाही अशक्य झालें होतें. (अपूर्ण.) १०-९-२१

कासले (चालू)

ससून व फिन्ले मूषाचा १९२७ चा संप लढवावा असें गि. का. महामंडळाच्या ए. कमिटीचे मत होतें. हातां होईल तों सार्वजनिक संप करूं नये असें ४-३-२८ च्या ए. कमिटींत

उठले होते. मि. का. महासंड्याचें मिनिट बुक पहा. सांख्यिक संप. कडू नये म्हणून महासंड्यानें सर्व तसेंचे प्रयत्न करून पाहिले, पण ते सर्व मालकांनीं हाणून पाडले. नाझाजास्तव कामकऱ्यांना सांख्यिक संप. करणें भाग पडलें. संपास सुरवात १६ एप्रिल १९२८ रोजीं झाली. माझी गिरणा ता. १४ एप्रिलपर्यंत चाडू होती. व तोपर्यंत मी कामावर होतो. गिरण बंद झाल्या-संपाचें नेतृत्व मि. का. महासंड्याकडे आहे होतें. संप झाल्यावर लोकचक्र श्री. एच. एच. जोशी व झाबवाळा हे संप कामितीच्या स्वागतेकरतां बोवूं लागले. मि. का. महासंड्याचें प्रतिनिधि जर निम्मे वेतले तर संप कामिती स्थापनी असें आमच्याकडून सांगण्यांत आले तें त्यांनीं कबूल केले. ४-५-१९२८ रोजीं सुरुक संप-कामिती स्थापण्यांत आली. तिच्यांत एकंदर तीस प्रतिनिधी होते. एच. एच. जोशी यांच्या टें. ठे. ग्रुपियन अथवा मि. का. संपातकें १० प्रतिनिधी, पांच कामगार व पांच बाहेरचे असे होते. त्यापैकीं बाहेरचे प्रति-निधि जोशी, जिनवाला, आसले, परुळेकर व सत्यद गुनावर हे होत व बाकीचे पांच कामगार होते. झाबवाळा यांच्या मिळकतेंसं ग्रुपियनतकें पांच, ते सर्व बाहेरचेच होते, ते असे: झाबवाळा, डांगे, निमकर, गिराकर, रेंडळे. मि. का. महासंड्यातकें सर्वंपरा प्रतिनिधी होते. ते सर्व कामगार होते, ते असे: अध्यक्ष ए. ए. आळवे, घुरी, गडकरी, सावंत, पदणेकर, आवसेकर, ताहणेकर, तावडे, कदम, सेंडेराव, देसाई, बी. टी. आळवे, मी. चोगळे वगैरे (P. W. 245 पहा.) जोशी यांच्या ग्रुपियनतकें कामगार पांच व महासंड्यातकें १५ मिळून २० कामगार प्रतिनिधी होते. त्यावरून संपकामितीवर कामकऱ्यांचें बहुमत होतें. त्यांच्याच बहुमतानें झोताता रत्तण्याचें व थान्य वांटण्याचें कार्यं व्यवस्थित चाडू होतें. हे आपण संपाचा इतिहास घेतल्यास आपल्या लक्षांत येईल. या सहा महिन्यांच्या संगत कामगारी मुकेंने वगैरे व्याकूळ झाले. त्याचे अनेक प्रकारें झाले. चरांकर टांच वगैरे आली व त्यानें आपलीं झोताता किंचितही दळूं दिली नाहीं. यावरून आपल्या लक्षांत येईल कीं, हा संप राजकीय नसून निवळ मालकांनीं कामगारांच्या पगारावर केलेला हछा परतविण्याकरतांच होता.

मि. का. महासंड्या असतांना मि. का. ग्रुपियन स्थापन करण्याचीं कारणें.

मालक म्हणूं लागले, आम्ही रजिस्टर्ड ग्रुपियनशींच बोलण्यास तयार आहोंत, असें मालकांचें पत्र श्री. जोशी ह्यांना अठें. तेव्हां मालक जर बोलण्यास तयार आहेत तर मि. का. महासंड्या रजिस्टर करावें असें महासंड्याच्या ए. कॅमिटीनें ठरविलें व संध्या रजिस्टर करण्याकरितां मि. आळवे व काहीं कामगार गेले. श्री. मधेकर ह्यांना महासंड्यांतून फाटण्यांत आलें होतें. रजिस्ट्रेशन ऑफिसात आम्हांस सांगण्यांत आलें कीं, मधेकर ह्यांनीं मि. का. महासंड्या नांवाची संस्था रजिस्टर्ड केेली. ह्या बाबतींत सवि-संगर हकीकत श्री. आळवे ह्यांनीं आपल्या जबाबीत सांगितलीच आहे. एकाच नांवाच्या दोन संस्था रजिस्टर्ड करतां येत नाहीं म्हणून दुसरी संस्था काढून रजिस्टर्ड करून संपाचें काम चालवावें व तडजोड होतें असल्यास रजिस्टर्ड संस्था नाहीं म्हणून थांबूं नये असें मि. का. महासंड्याच्या ए. कॅमिटीनें ठरविलें. महासंड्याचा असा नियम होता कीं, बाहेरचे लोक ग्रुपियनमध्ये घेऊं नयेत. श्री. आळवे ह्यांनीं सांगितलें कीं, हे लोक ट्रेड ग्रुपियनमणोंच कामकऱ्यांचें काम करणारे आहेत व ते कामकऱ्यांचें काम चांगलें करतील. आपल्याकडे इंग्रजी पत्रव्यवहार करावयाचा असल्यास आपल्यास दुसरीकडे जावें लागतें तर तो हे ठिठून देतील. आळवे यांच्यावर आमचा विश्वास होता. आम्ही कामावर असल्यामुळे सर्व अधिकार त्यांना ए. कॅमिटीनें दिला होता. म्हणून आम्ही त्यांच्या संगण्यावर विश्वास ठेवून ह्या बाहे-रच्या लोकांबद्दल हे कोण आहेत, काय करतात ह्याविषयीं जास्त विचारपूस केेली नाहीं. मि. का. महासंड्या ही संस्था श्री. मधेकर ह्यांनीं रजिस्टर्ड करून घेतल्यानंतर एका नांवाच्या दोन संस्था रजिस्टर्ड करतां येत नाहीं म्हणून मी नवी संस्था मि. का. ग्रुपियनजन्मास आली व तिची स्थापना २२ मे १९२८ रोजीं यातून सयानीच्या वाढींत आली. आळवे ह्यांच्या अध्यक्षतेखालीं झाली. ह्या ग्रुपियनच्या नव्या निवडणुकी त्याच सभेंत झाल्या. त्यावेळीं ज्ञान्यमहासंड्याचे सर्व अधिकारी लोक पुनः निवडणुकीस उभे राहिले होते. तसे बाहेरचे हे लोकही निवडणुकीसाठीं उभे राहिले होते. मी वर सांगितलेच आहे कीं, हे बाहेरचे लोक कोण व काय ह्याबद्दलची मंडा व तशीच आम्ही कामकऱ्यांना माहिती नव्हती. परंतु हे ट्रेड ग्रुपियनसिस्ट ग्रहण्य आहेत व कामकऱ्यांच्याच हिताचें काम करणारे आहेत, तसेच हे निस्काशी आहेत, कामेसक आहेत, देशाची सेवा करणारे आहेत, योग्यकाराची ह्यांच्याबद्दल शोभनी श्री. आळवे ह्यांनीं मार्गदर्श्यामुळे त्या निवडणुकीला विरोध झाला नाहीं, तर ते विनाविरोध निवडून आले असें कांहीं नाहीं. त्या सभेंत सुद्धा ह्या बाहेरच्या लोकांबद्दल शोबीशी गडबड झाली होती. ती अशी.—आमच्या ग्रुपियनमध्ये

बाहेरचे लोक नकोत असा वादविवाद काहीं लोकांकडून होत होता. आळवे यांनी काहीं अडचणी लोकांपुढे मांडल्या त्या अशा:-आम्हां कामगारांच्या युनियनमध्ये इंग्रजी लिहिणारा वाचणारा गृहस्थ नसल्यामुळे कामाची दिरंगाई होते व पदोपदी अडचण भासते. त्या युनियनचें काम जसे योग्यशा मार्गांनी चालवें तसे चालवितां येत नाही, म्हणजे मालकांशीं इंग्रजी पत्रव्यवहार करणें, मालकांशीं इंग्रजीत बोलणें-चालणें करणें इत्यादि सर्वही लोकांच्या डोळ्यांपुढे श्री. आळवे ह्यांनीं आणून ठेवल्यामुळे गढबड शांत झाली व निवडणुकीचा कार्यक्रम पार पडला. त्या दिवसापासून ह्या बाहेरच्या लोकांची माझी ओळख झाली. त्यापूर्वीं मी त्यांना कधींच पाहिलें नव्हतें व माझी ओळखही नव्हती. गि. का. युनियनच्या अधिकारीमंडळाची निवडणूक झाली ती येणेंप्रमाणें:-अध्यक्ष आळवे, उपाध्यक्ष-ताम्हणेकर, शाबवाला, वॅडले, निमकर; सेक्रेटरी, डांगे, तावडे, साटम, जोगळेकर; सजिनदार-बी. टी. आळवे व घाटे. ह्या लोकांच्यापूर्वीं शाबवालाची माझी ओळख होती; पण जास्त परिचय नव्हता. ए. कामिटी निवडण्यांत आली त्यांत मलाही निवडण्यांत आलें. त्या कमिटीची संख्या पचासवर होती. हें जर तुम्हांला पहा-त्याचें असेल तर ए. कामिटीचा फोटो P. 66१ पहा. कामिटीचे तीस पसतीस मेंबर त्यांत आहेत; पण ज्या-वेळीं हा फोटो काढला त्यावेळीं बरेच लोक गैरहजर होते म्हणून तो फोटो अपुरा आहे. युनियनचा जन्म जरी संपात झाला असला तरी संपाचें कार्य मात्र संयुक्त संप कमिटीच्यामार्फत चालत असे. आतां या सहा महिन्यांच्या मोठ्या संपाबद्दल हकीगत सांगू लागलों तर मोठा ग्रंथ होईल. निष्कारण कोटांचा भ्रमूण वेळ सचें केल्यासारखें होईल म्हणून थोडक्यांत सांगतां. माझ्या सांगण्याचा मुद्दा हा की, आम्ही कामगारांनीं हा जो संप केला होता आणि संपांत भाग घेतला तो संप राजकीय स्वरूपाचा नव्हता म्हणून घेतला. जर आपण आमच्या संपाच्या मागण्यांकडे पाहिलें तर सहज आपल्या लक्षांत येईल की, या संप मालकांनीं आम्हां कामकरण्यांच्या पगारावर केलेला हल्ला परतविण्याकरतांच होता. ज्या वेळेस या संपाचा शेवट सेक्रेटरीपदमध्ये मुंबई सरकारचे जनरल मेंबर सर हिदायतुल्ला ह्यांच्या मध्यस्तीनें झाला त्याही वेळीं ज्या कामगारांच्या मागण्या होत्या त्या मागण्या सर्व आळवे ह्यांनीं आपल्या डेटमेंटमध्ये सांगितल्याच आहेत. त्या येथें सांगण्याची काहीं जरूरी नाही. जनरल मेंबर हिदायतुल्ला, गळकांचे प्रतिनिधि व कामगारांचे प्रतिनिधि ह्यांच्यामध्ये ह्या मागण्यांची वाटाघाट होऊन ह्या मागण्या नर देण्यांत येतील तर संप माघारीं घेण्यांत येईल असें कामगार पुढाऱ्यांकडून सांगण्यांत आलें. मागण्या मान्य केल्यानंतर संप माघारीं घेण्यांत आला. परंतु वरील मागण्या फॉसेट कामिटीचा रिपोर्ट जाहीर झाल्यावर मान्य करण्यांत आल्या होत्या. ह्या सर्व गोष्टीवरून आपल्यास कळून येईल की, हा संप राज-कीय स्वरूपाचा नव्हता. परंतु ह्या संपामध्ये मी जीं भाषणें केळीं आहेत म्हणून सांगण्यांत येत आहे त्या भाषणास भयंकर स्वरूप देऊन ह्या कटांत मला गोंवण्याचा प्रोसिक्युशन करून प्रयत्न करण्यांत येत आहे, त्याच्याबद्दल मी येथें थोडक्यांत सांगतां. संपाच्या काळांत म्हणजे कामकरण्यांच्या पोटाच्या मागण्या मिळण्याकरतां शांततेनें संप चालू असतांना आमच्यावर पोलीस लोकांनीं जो हल्ला केला त्याची ओढक्यांत हकीकत देतां. कामगार शांततेनें घरीं बसले असले तरी त्यांच्या घरीं जाऊन त्यांस मारझोड देणें, जबरदस्तीनें कापलेल्या पगारावर काम करण्यास सांगणें, कामगार सभा शांततेनें चालवीत असतां यांच्या सभेवर हल्ला करणें, सभा संपल्यावर कामगार घरीं जात असतां त्यांच्यावर लाठ्या चालविणें, जो ग्रामगार हातांत मिळेल त्यास पोलीस चौकीवर नेऊन बंद करून चोप देणें, कामगार व्हालंटीअर लोकांस आणणें, त्यांच्यावर वाटेत तो आरोप लादून तुरुंगांत टाकणें, वगैरे वगैरे गोष्टी करणें हें सर्व पाहून पात अन्नापाण्यावांचून त्रासल्यामुळे, घरांतील मुलाबळांचे हाल पाहून एकादे वेळीं रागाच्या भरांत किंवा राबिशांत वाईट साईट शब्द बोललों असेन परंतु माझ्या भाषणाचा हेतु मात्र लोकांच्या मनांत रकाराबद्दल द्वेष पसरविण्याचा किंवा उत्पन्न करण्याचा किंवा राजद्रोह करण्याचा नव्हता. हें किंवा त्या वेळेच्या परिस्थितीस कंटाळून अथवा असहाय्य होऊन काहीं वाईट साईट गोष्टी माझ्या कडून निघाल्या असतील. त्या भाषणांत काहीं सऱ्या असतील, कांहीं रिपोटरांनीं घुसडल्या असतील. ते असें म्हणत नाहीं कीं मी भाषणें केळीं नाहीं. मी साळच्याच कोर्टांत सांगितलें आहे कीं, मी भाषणें केळीं आहेत. भाषणांच्या वावर्तीत मराठी रिपोटरांनीं लिहिलें एक, तें शॉर्ट हँडवरून लिहिलें दुसरेंच, व ग्लिझमधें लिहिलें तिसरेंच. माझीं जीं कांहीं भाषणें आहेत तीं फक्त संपापुरतीं. आमच्या वाईट परिस्थि-तेचा परिणाम झाला होता म्हणून एखादे वेळीं तोंडून वाईट साईट शब्द निघावे असतील. राज्य उलथून लोकांच्या किंवा दुसऱ्या कोणत्याही प्रकारची चिथावणी करण्याचा हेतु नव्हता. संप कशा प्रकारे केलें एवढाच हेतु होता. संपाच्या पूर्वीं किंवा संपाच्यानंतर मी कोणत्याही राजकीय सभेला गेलेलां नाहीं. फक्त कामगार युनियनपुरतेंच माझें काम होतें. (अपूर्ण) 12-9-31

कासले (चारू)

पोलिसच्या जुलमाविषयी सर लेस्ली विल्सन मुंबईचे गव्हर्नर यांस कळले होते. P. 439 (20) पहा. मी जें माझ्या भाषणाविषयी मागे सांगितलें आहे, कीं मी पोलिसाचा निषेध केला असेल पण माझ्या भाषणांत रिपोर्टरनें ज्या ' मारा, झोडा ' अशा अनेक गोष्टी घातल्या आहेत त्या मात्र मला कबूल नाहीत. असे शब्द मी बिलकूल वापरले नाहीत. P. 966 पहा. सत्याग्रह करा, बहिष्कार टाका, बहिष्काराची तयारी करा असे त्यांत म्हटलें आहे P. 966 हेंडबिल पाहिल्यावरून आम्ही जें कार्य करीत होतो त्याची साक्षी होईल. तीन सांचे दोन बाजूंची पद्धत हाणून पाडा व शांततेनें संप करा, सत्याग्रह करा हें त्या हेंडबिलांत लिहिलें आहे. आतां कलकत्त्याच्या कामकरी शेतकरी परिषदेविषयी मी सांगतो (P. 943, 943, 945) मी कलकत्त्यास किंवा झारियाट्रेड युनिअन काँग्रेसला गेलों नाहीं P. W. 254 २ आपल्या रिपोर्टींत माझा मुलगा बी. जी. कासले याचें नांव परिषदेला हजर होता असें लिहिलें आहे परंतु त्यानें सालच्या कोर्टीत माझी ओळख करते वेळीं असें सांगितलें कीं, कलकत्ता परिषदेला कासले हजर होते. तें त्याचें सांगणे साफ सोटें आहे. त्यांची साक्ष बिलकूल विश्वसनीय नाही. कारण कीं, वरच्या कोर्टीत त्यानें माझें नांव गाळलें आहे. त्यानें दुसऱ्या कांहीं मंडळींच्याविषयी असें सांगितलें कीं, जे बिलकूलच परिषदेला गेले नाहीत व जे कोणी एखादे दिवशीं जरा वेळ गेले होते त्यांचीं नांवां P. W. 254 २ आपल्या रिपोर्टीमध्ये तिन्ही दिवस हजर असल्याविषयी दाखविलीं आहेत. त्याखेरीज P. W. 254 २ मी गौरीशंकर ह्यांना सालच्या कोर्टीत ओळखले नाहीं. व वरच्या कोर्टीत आढळते वेळीं त्यानें असें सांगितलें कीं, गौरीशंकर ह्यांना मी सालच्या कोर्टीत ओळखले आहे. पण मॅजिस्ट्रेटनीं तें लिहून घेतलें नसेल, असें सांगून त्यांनीं मॅजिस्ट्रेटला पण सोटें ~~काढले~~ आहे. परिषदेचा रिपोर्ट P. W. 36 २ पण केला आहे. ह्या कोर्टीत P. W. 254 २ मी साक्ष देतेवेळीं पहिल्यानें माझें नांव गाळलें. नंतर उलट तपासणीच्या वेळीं सांगितलें कीं, कासल्यांना मला कोणी तेंथें दाखवले. कासले माझ्याकडे पाठ करून बसले होते. तो मनुष्य कासल्यासारखें दिसत होता. सालची साक्ष P. W. 179 २ वरची P. W. 254 पहा. ह्या साक्षीदारांनें किती खोटी साक्ष दिली आहे हें P. 459 ज्या ठिकाणीं माझ्या मुलाचा फोटो आहे त्यावरून समजतें. ह्या माझ्या मुलास येथें आल्यावर स्वतः आपण पाहिलें आहे कीं, त्याच्या व माझ्या फोटोमध्ये किती जमीन अस्मानचें अंतर आहे. त्याखेरीज त्या साक्षीदारांनें हें पण सांगितलें आहे कीं, माझ्या नांवाचें पाहिलें अक्षर बी. जी. कासले आहे व त्याला माझ्या नांवाचें अक्षरही माहिती नव्हतें. त्याच्या रिपोर्टमध्ये एकच कासले परिषदेमध्ये हजर होता व त्याचें नांव बी. जी. कासले होतें. त्याखेरीज परिषदेचा रिपोर्ट P. 334. पान नं. ८७ पैरा नं. ३ मध्ये लिहिलें आहे कीं, परिषदेमध्ये एक मुंबई गिरणी कामगाराचा लहान मुलगा शांतेत शिकणारा बी. जी. कासले ह्यानें भाषण केले होतें. या सर्व गोष्टींवरून समजतें कीं, मी कलकत्ता परिषदेमध्ये हजर नव्हतो. पण माझा मुलगा कलकत्ता पाहाण्यास गेला होता. त्याप्रमाणें P. W. 254 २ ची साक्ष बिलकूल सोटी आहे. P. 942, 943, 945 हें पक्षिभ्रष्ट माझ्या सुचेंमधुनें आहेत ती सर्व इस्टेट माझ्या मुलांनें आणली असतील. व त्याचें सामान आणि पुस्तकें ~~साक्षी~~ सोबत सदतीत मिळाई असतील. P. W. 201 ह्यानें सांगितलें आहे कीं, त्याच्यावर B. G. Kasle आणि M. G. Kasle नांवां लिहिलीं होती. ही जी इस्टेट आणलेली ती माझ्यावर लादली गेली. मी गिरणीत काम करीत असल्यामुळे माझ्या घरांत दुसरें मिळणार काय ? मी वर्तमानपत्रें वाचत नव्हतो किंवा कोर्टें गुप्त कारस्थानें करीत नव्हतो किंवा कोठल्या गुप्त कटाशीं माझा संबंधही नव्हता. अशाप्रकारें १२१ प. कलमाबाळीं माझ्यावर भयंकर कटाचा आरोप केला आहे. प्रोसिक्युशननें माझ्यावर भयंकर जोर दिला आहे. कासल्यांना सर्व कांहीं माहीत होतें असा जो जोर देण्यांत आला आहे तो मला मान्य नाही. येथें आल्यावर केस चालते वेळीं पहातो. कोठचा कम्युनिस्ट, कोठचा लेनिनिझम, कोठचा जर्मनिझम, हे सर्व येथें आल्यावर एकतो आहे. हें आम्ही बेव्हाही ऐकिलें नव्हतें. इतकेंच कीं आपल्या मुलाबाळांचें व कुटुंबाचें संरक्षण कशा रितीनें होईल व आपली कायदेशीर रितीनें मुघारणा कशी होईल हेंच माझें ध्येय होते. आतां मुंबईच्या कामकरी शेतकी पक्षाविषयी बोलतो. P. 1343-1344 माझ्याविरुद्ध ह्या चार्ज आहे कीं, मी मुंबईच्या कामकरी शेतकरी पक्षाचा सभासद होतो. त्याविषयीं सालच्या कोर्टीत सांगितलेंच आहे कीं, बरेचसे लोक आमच्याजवळ येतात आणि कामगारां व कांहीं लिहिलेल्या फार्मवर अर्जांवर सहा करीत म्हणून सांगतात; कारण कीं, आम्हांला लिहितां वाचतां येत नाहीं, कायदेज्ञान माहीत नाहीं, अशा आमच्या अज्ञानाचा फायदा घेऊन तुमचें चांगलें करतो, तुमच्या हिताच्या गोष्टी आहेत, तुमच्यातकें कॉन्सिळांत जावयाचें आहे, मी तुमच्या हिताकरतां म्युनिसिपालिटींत उभा राहणार आहे, तुमच्या अडचणी दूर करण्याकरतां आम्ही सटपट करूं वगैरे गोष्टी सांगून आमच्या जवळून सही घेतात, त्याचप्रमाणें माझ्या जवळ कोणी आला. असेल आणि मला सांगितलें असेल कीं.

कामगाराच्या आणि शेतकऱ्यांच्या हिताच्या गोष्टी आहेत असे सांगून सही घेतली असेल. मी पहिल्यानेच सांगितले आहे की, माझा धंदा शेतीचा होता आणि मी मिल्मध्येही काम करित होतो. म्हणून मी त्या फार्मवर सही केली असेन. ज्या फार्मवर माझी सही दाखविली जाते तो फार्म इंग्रजीत आहे. पहिल्यानेच मी सांगितले आहे की, मला इंग्रजी येत नाही व मला कोणी त्या पक्षाचे नियम वाचून दाखविले नाहीत किंवा मी वर्गणीही दिली नाही. P. 1343 पहा. किंवा मी कोणत्याही मीटिंगमध्ये गेलो नाही किंवा कोणत्याही बाबतीत त्याविषयी मला सूचना मिळाली नाही. P. 1373 (1) मीटिंगमध्ये मी हजर आहे. त्याविषयी मला असे आठवते की, त्या दिवशी कामगारांच्या सभेकरता चौपाटीवर ब्रिक्कोरिया मिल्च्या कामगार मंडळीच्या सभेस गेलो. जाते वेळी माझ्याबरोबर तारळकर व कांदळकर हे होते. सभेस बराच वेळ असल्यामुळे जातेवेळी रस्त्यावर घोटे रहात होते त्या ठिकाणी आम्ही गेलो. त्यावेळी युनिअनच्या बाबतीत वर्गणीच्या वगैरे गोष्टी निघाल्या. त्यावेळी बाहेरच्या कारकुनाविषयी गोष्टी निघाल्या व पांच रुपये रोज देऊन बाहेरचे मनुष्य आणून ठेवले त्याविषयी मी म्हणालो की, कामगार सोडून बाहेरचे लोक युनियनमध्ये कशांना पाहिजेत. एका मनुष्याला दररोज पांच रुपये देऊन पंधरा माणसे ठेवावयाची त्या पैसांनी कामगार लोक बेकार आहेत त्यांना एक रुपया रोज देऊन मराठी पावती लिहिण्यास ठेवावे. बाहेरच्या लोकांना पांच रुपये रोज देण्याची काय जरूर आहे? काही कामगारांना मराठी साधारण लिहिता येते असे पुढळसे कामगार बेकार आहेत व त्यांना काम द्यावे. त्यापासून बेकार कामगारांना मदत पण होईल आणि युनियनचा खर्च पण कमी होईल. बाहेरचे शिकलेले लोक कशांना पाहिजेत. त्यावेळी माझा आणि बाकीच्या आमच्या मंडळींचा हांगे वगैरेचा तंट्या झाला व त्यावरून मी तेथून निघून चौपाटीवर कामगारांच्या मीटिंगला निघून गेलो. मी कामगारीशेतकरी पक्षाच्या मीटिंगला निघून गेलो नव्हतो. किंवा मला कोणत्याही तऱ्हेचे बोलावणे नव्हते P. 1344 पान नं. १०७ पॅरा नं. ५ पहा.

P. 645 बद्दल सांगतो. मि. बॅडले यांच्या डायरीत माझे नांव व पत्ता लिहिलेला होता तो कां लिहून ठेवला होता हे मला कळणे अशक्य आहे. त्यांनी कोणत्या उद्देशाने हा पत्ता लिहिला होता ते मी सांगू शकणार नाही. त्याच्याबद्दल त्यांनाच माहिती.

P. 662, 776, 932, 964 हे मि. का. युनियनच्या मॅनेजिंग कमिटीचे अपुरे फोटो आहेत. मि. का. युनियनची निवडणूक झाली, त्यानंतर सुमारे पंधरा दिवसांनी हे काढण्यात आले. फोटो काढण्याकरिता सर्व मॅनेजिंग कमिटीच्या लोकांना सकाळी दहा वाजता दामोदर हॉलमध्ये जमण्यास सांगितले होते. पण फोटोग्राफरने सांगितले की, दहा वाजता ऊन जास्त पडेल व फोटो चांगला निघणार नाही तर तुम्ही सकाळीच फोटो काढा. मॅने. कमिटीच्या लोकांस अगोदरच सांगितल्यामुळे दुसऱ्या दिवशी जितके लोक हजर होते तेवढ्यांचाच फोटो काढण्यात आला. दहा वाजता सर्व लोक आले, पण त्या पूर्वी फोटोग्राफरफोटो काढून गेला होता. त्यामुळे सर्वांचा फोटो निघाला नाही. म्हणून ते फोटो अपुरे आहेत. मीही मॅ. कमिटीचा मेम्बर होतो, म्हणून माझाही फोटो त्यांच्यात आहे.

P. 959, P. 949, P. 971, P. 954, ह्याबद्दल सांगतो. मि. का. युनियनमधून युनियनचे कामाकरिता किरकोळ खर्चाकरिता घेतलेल्या रकमांचा हिशोब आहे. मी अगोदरच सांगितले आहे की, मी युनियनच्या मॅ. कमिटीचा मेम्बर होतो व नंतर उपाध्यक्ष झालो तेव्हा कामकऱ्यांच्या तक्रारी मिटण्याकरिता व काही अडचणी व तक्रालिफी दूर करण्याकरिता मला गिरणीमध्ये वगैरे जावे लागत असे. त्यामुळे गाडीमाळ्याकरिता वगैरे पैसे घेत असे, व त्याच्या रितीदी कमिटीपुढे मांडण्याकरिता देत असून त्यावरून मी अगर कोणी किती पैसे घेतले व किती खर्च केले त्याचा अकाऊंट लिहिला जाई, त्यात माझे नांव आहे.

P. 944 हा एक कागद आहे. त्यावर मि. का. युनियनच्या मॅ. कमिटीच्या मेम्बरची नावे आहेत. त्यात माझेही नांव आहे. हे कोणी व कां लिहिले होते हे कागदावरून मी काय सांगू तो कागद पाहिला तर त्यावर फक्त मॅ. कमिटीच्या लोकांची नावे आहेत. त्यात मुद्दा नाही विषय नाही. तेव्हा अशा कागदाबद्दल ज्यास्त काही सांगू शकत नाही. हा कागद मी आपल्या हाताने लिहिलेला नाही. कदाचित मॅ. कमिटीच्या माणसांची नावे आहेत. ती ओळखण्याकरिता लिहिली असती.

P. 558 हे मि. का. यु. चे मिनिट बुक आहे. मी वर सांगितलेच आहे की, मी पूर्वी या युनियनच्या मॅ. कमिटीचा सभासद होतो. व श्री. ह्याबवाला यांनी आपल्या उपाध्यक्षत्वाचा राजिनामा दिल्यानंतर त्या जागी कामगार लोकांनी माझी नेमणूक केली. तेव्हापासून मी एकटला जाईपर्यंत मी उपाध्यक्ष होतो तेव्हा मला ह्या कमिटीच्या मीटिंगला हजर राहावे लागत असे व त्यामध्ये माझ्या नांवाने जो उल्लेख आहे तो असणे साहजिक आहे. मी त्या कमिटीत कामगारहिताचे उरावही आणीत असे कारण ही.

युनियन आम्हां निव्वळ कामगारांची होती आणि हा युनियनमध्ये मी कामगार असल्यामुळे काम करणे मी आपले कर्तव्य समजत होतो. गि. का. युनियनच्या मं. कमिटीमध्ये माझ्यासारखे ऐश्वर्यीत कामगार येऊन होते. प्रत्येक गिरणीत मिल्कमिडी होती. असे सांगण्या मिल्क कमिटीचे म्हणून पुष्कळ लोक होते, युनियनचे सर्व कार्य कामगारांतर्फेच चालत असे, हाबद्दल सर्व खुलासा श्री. आळवे यांनी केला आहे. तेव्हा हा बाबतीत मलाही जास्त सांगावेस वाटत नाही; परंतु मला मात्र हा बाहेरच्या चार पांच लोकांबद्दल सांगायचे आहे. त्यांनी जर आम्हां कामगारांच्या आणि मॅनेजिंग कमिटीच्या पध्दात काही गुप्त कारस्थान केले असले किंवा युनियनच्या कारभारात आमच्या पध्दात आमच्या अज्ञानपणाचा फायदा घेऊन ठवळाढवळ केली असेल किंवा जर गुप्त कारस्थान केले असेल तर ते ईश्वरपासच माहीत त्याबद्दल आम्ही जोसमदार नाही, त्यांचे ते जोसमदार. हा युनियनच्या कारभाराबद्दल इतकेच सांगायचे आहे की ही युनियन सरकारी नियमाप्रमाणे रजिस्टर केलेली आहे व आम्हां कामगारांच्या आर्थिक परिस्थितीबद्दल काम करणारी मान्यवंत संस्था होती व तिचे कार्य व नियम आपण पाहिले तर आपणांस कळेल की ही संस्था काही नैरकारधदा नव्हती. आतां प. १९६६ व २. १९६७ ही गि. का. यु. तर्फे प्रसिद्ध झालेली हॅंडबिले आहेत. परंतु त्यावर पाहिले तर माझे नांव आहे. हॅंडबिले काढण्याचे कार्य युनियनचे सेक्रेटरी करित असत. ती हॅंडबिले काढल्यानंतर माझ्या पाहण्यांत आली. तेव्हां त्या हॅंडबिलांत 'लाल फौजा' वगैरे वगैरे मोठी जादी भाषा लिहिलेली होती. ही जादी व भावदस्त भाषा लिहिण्याचा सेक्रेटरीचा काय हेतु होता त्याबद्दल तोच सांगू शकेल !

आतां तीन सांचे व दोन बाजूंची पद्धत जर मालकानीं बंद केली नाही तर ती जुलमी पद्धत बंद करण्याकरतां कामगारांनीं सत्याग्रह करून ती पद्धत बंद पाडावी. आमच्या हातांत अशी कोणती शक्ति आहे की, त्या शक्तीने आम्ही तीन सांचे दोन बाजूंची पद्धत बंद पाडू शकू ? तर ती म्हणजे सत्याग्रह, बहिष्कार, सत्याग्रह व बहिष्कार याविषयी मी आपल्या भाषणाचा खुलासा करतोवेळी सांगितलेच आहे. पांचशे किंवा पांच हजार लाल फौजा अशी जी हॅंडबिलांमध्ये शब्दयोजना आहे ती युनियनचे एक व्हॅलंटिअर पथक होते. त्याला आम्ही व्हॅलंटिअर पथक म्हणू, परंतु 'लाल फौजा' हा शब्द वापरण्याचा सेक्रेटरीचाकाय हेतु होता हे ईश्वरच जाणो. आम्ही त्याला व्हॅलंटिअर पथकच म्हणत असू. शांततेने सत्याग्रह करण्याकरतां व्हॅलंटिअरची गरज होती, व युनियनची वर्णणी गिरण्यातून मोळा करण्याकरतां व्हॅलंटिअरची गरज लागते. त्याशिवाय सभेत व्यवस्था करण्याकरतां व्हॅलंटिअरची गरज होती. असे व्हॅलंटिअर पथक हे आजच उभारले नव्हते तर गि. का. म. मंडळाच्या स्थापनेपासून होतें. (अर्पण.) 14-9-91

कासले (चारु)

लाल फौजा वगैरे शब्द वापरल्याबद्दल सेक्रेटरीस गि. का. यु. च्या मं. कमिटीने तंबी दिली होती. त्या हॅंडबिलांच्या बाबतीत श्री. आळवे ह्यांनी सविस्तर खुलासा केला आहे.

मला युनियनमधून काढून टाकण्याकरितां ह्यांनी केलेले प्रयत्न.

मला युनियनमधून काढून टाकण्याचा ह्यांनी जो प्रयत्न केला त्या बाबतीत मला येथे शोधक्यांत सांगायचे आहे. मी युनियनचा उपाध्यक्ष झाल्यानंतर ह्यांचे व माझे जमेना म्हणून श्री. दगि हे माझ्याविरुद्ध मला युनियनमधून काढून टाकण्याकरितां कट तयार करित होते. हे जर आपणांस पहावयाचे असेल, तर त्यांच्या पाठीच्या मिनिरिडुकांत प. 1344 पान नं. 109, 3-2-29 ची मिनिरिडु पहा.

प. 1727 हा माझ्या भाषणामध्ये मी निमकरांता गुरु म्हटले आहे असे रिविडरनीं आपल्या रिविडरिंत दाखवण्याचा प्रयत्न केला आहे. तो निव्वळ सोटा आहे. कारण निमकरांचे आणि माझे गुरुशिष्यांचे नाते होणे शक्यच नव्हते. जर निमकरांचे माझे नाते नव्हते असले तर वादी व प्रतिवादी ह्यांच्या नात्याने नव्हते आहे. हे मी येथे सांगतो अशी गोष्ट नव्हे तर मी पकडला जाण्याच्या आगोवर निमकर कॅंपूचे व माझे वडीलची, दिवसें दिवस व वेळोवेळीं करे सटके उडत होते हे आपण पाहिलेले म्हणजे आपले लक्षांत घ्याल. ते D 435, मधुबंधू 3-3-29 हेडिंग 'निमकर विरुद्ध कासले' फौलम नंबर 1 व 2 पान नं. 1 पहा. D 435 (2) हा मी एकच सुद्धा येथे दाखवितो; परंतु माझे व निमकर कॅंपूचे कसकसे सटके उडत होते ते मी वेळेर असतो तर मला दाखवण्यास संचि मिळाली असती हाच्या माझ्या हाड्याचे कागद मिळवण्यास मला सवलती मिळाल्या असत्या तर मी पुराव्यानिशी सिद्ध करून दाखवले असते. हाच्याविरुद्ध मी होतो व माझेविरुद्ध हे होते. त्याचे पुरावे येथे माझ्या ह्यांती नार्हीत म्हणून मला या छोट्याशा पुराव्यावर मांगवून घेणे भाग पडत आहे. तसेच त्या लोकांच्या 'क्रांती'

नामधेयें माझ्याविरुद्ध सोर्टीनादीं विधानें हे लोक कसे करीत होते हें आपणांस पहावयास पांढरेल. क्रांति १०-३-२९ 'कासले यांची घमकी' (D 782) होडिंग. ह्याशिवाय ह्यांनीं, माझ्याविरुद्ध क्रांतिपत्रामधून केलेले पुष्कळसे प्रयत्न दाखवितो येतील. परंतु माझ्या आजारीपणामुळे माझा नाहलाज आहे. तें मी नंतर लेखी जवानांत लिहून देईन.

माझीं भाषणें म्हणून जे डीक्युमेंट घालण्यांत आले आहेत, त्याबद्दल मी थोडक्यांत सांगतों. मी वतः कामकरी आहे. १९२८ च्या संपांत माझी स्थिति कंगाल झाली होती. घरीं माणसें उपाशीं होतीं. गमकऱ्यांच्या पगारावर मालकांनीं केलेला हल्ला परत फिरवण्याकरतां संप केलेला होता. त्याशिवाय तीन आंचे दोन बाजूंची जुलमीपद्धत बंद करावयाची होती. आम्ही पोटाकरतां केलेल्या संपांत पोळिसचा काहींक संबंध नव्हता; पण पोलीस कामकऱ्यांना वाटेळ तसा तसा देत. कामकऱ्यांना सपाटून मार देत, व्हाळेंयिर्सना पकडून वाटेळतसे चौकीत चोपीत. ह्या सर्व पोलीसलीला पाहून मी त्यांच्या क्रुत्याचा निषेध व्हा असेन, पण त्यांना ' मारा, हांकून लावा ' वगैरे वगैरे हिंसात्मक शब्द मी केव्हांच उच्चारले नाहींत. माझीं भाषणें जर वाचलीं तर वरच्या वाक्याचा संबंध सालच्या वाक्याशीं जमत नाहीं, त्यांत अगडबंब शब्द घालण्यांत आले आहेत. ह्या सर्वांवरून रिपोर्टांनीं माझ्या विचाराचा वाटेळ तसा अर्थ केला आहे असें मला वाटतें. रिपोर्ट दडपून देतात हें P. W. 254 रायसाहेब त्रिवेदी ह्यांनीं मी कलकत्यास गेलों नसतांना लोंहोतों म्हणून सांगितलें आहे त्यावरून आपल्या लक्षांत येईल. मी माझ्या भाषणांत केव्हांच 'कम्युनिझम' शब्द वापरला नाहीं. मी भाषणांत आम्हांस कामकरी राज्य पाहिजे म्हटलें होतें असें रिपोर्टांनीं आपले रिपोर्ट लिहिलें आहे. त्याबद्दल मला थोडासा सुलासा करावयाचा आहे. 'कामकरी राज्या' ची व्याख्या इतरांपेक्षा माझी निराळी आहे. कामकऱ्यांना शिक्षण नसल्यामुळे त्यांना बाणी, मावाडी, इतर सावकार चकवतात असें गिरणींतले अधिकारीही पगाराच्या हिशेबांत फसवाफसवी करतात; तसेंच जुलूमजरदस्ती करतात. कामकरी राज्य म्हणजे कामकऱ्यांच्या मुलांना शिक्षण, कामकऱ्यांना राहण्यास चांगली जागा, मांगभर कपडा हें मिळावें कीं कामकरी खुष झाला. त्यांचें राज्य तें हें. कामकऱ्यांना नागरिकत्वाचा हक्क, गमकऱ्यांना कौन्सिलांत, असेंब्लींत जागा, माझ्या भाषणाचा रोख सदां कामकऱ्यांच्या हिताकडे व सुधारणेकडे होता. हल्लीं इंग्लंडांतील कामकरी राज्य चालवीत आहेत ना? हिंदुस्थानांतल्या कामकऱ्यांना हेशोब करतां येत नाहीं त्यावरून कामकऱ्यांचें राज्य म्हणजे त्यांचें शिक्षण, त्यांची आर्थिक सुधारणा, गमकऱ्यांच्या पोटापाण्याचा व आर्थिक सुधारणेचा प्रश्न, मग तो रॅसे मॅन्वोल्व्हच्या प्रधानमंडळांत सुटो, पाल्लविनच्या सुटो अगर महात्मा गांधींच्या सुटो, त्याविषयीं आमची काहींच ना नाहीं. मी जीं भाषणें केलीं तीं बादशाहाचे राज्य उलटण्याच्या हेतूनें नव्हे अगर राजद्रोह पसरवण्याच्या हेतूनें नव्हे, किंवा संप घडवून पाणून मला ' लीडरशिप ' संभाळावयाची होती म्हणून नव्हे किंवा इसच्या देशच्या पैशावर आपला निर्वाह करावयाचा होता म्हणून नव्हे, किंवा कामगऱ्यांच्या नांवानें स्वतःची प्रौढी मला मिळावयाची नव्हती. एत कारस्थान करून कामकऱ्यांच्या अज्ञानाचा मला फायदा घ्यावयाचा नव्हता. मी स्वतः अज्ञानी आहे, गमगारावर होत असलेला जुलूम नाहींसा होण्याकरितांच मी ह्या संपांत भाग घेतला व भाषणें केलीं. मी कम्युनिस्ट नाहीं व मला कम्युनिझम म्हणजे काय तें कळत नाहीं. मी कामगार आहे. माझ्या पोटाचा अश्रु सोडवण्याकरितांच मी गिरणींत दहा बारा तास काम करीत होतीं. मला जे काहीं मुद्दे व्यवस्थित सांगवयाचे होते ते मला माझ्या आजारीपणामुळे सांगतां आंटे नाहींत. मी आजारी असल्यामुळे माझे गेकें शांत नाहीं. त्यांतच ज्यास्त कमी सांगितलें असेल. माझ्या मनांत एखाद्या मुद्याचा विचार तर येऊं लागला तर माझ्या आजारीपणाच्या वेदनेनें तो निघून जातो व त्या मुद्याच्या नेचाराचें खंडण होतें. अशा परिस्थितींत कोर्टांनीं सांगितल्यावरून मी माझे स्टेटमेंट कसें बसें पुरें करीत आहे. माझी स्थिति आपण पहातच आहां. मी चुकल्यामुक्तल्या मुद्याचा व जे मुद्दे व्यवस्थित सांगितले पाहिजेत ते सर्व मी माझ्या परिस्थितींत आराम वाटल्यावर लिहून देईन. आतां जो त भयंकर कटाचा आरोप १२१ ए कलमासाठीं माझ्यावर लागू केला आहे त्या बाबतींत मी अगदीं नेंदेष आहे. मी सांगितलेले माझे विचार व कार्ये जर आपण पाहिलें तर आर्थिक परिस्थितीतून कायदेपिर मार्गानें बाहेर पडण्याकरितां ट्रेड युनियनच्या मार्गानें काम केलें आहे. माझा हेतु व प्रयत्न निव्वळ गमकऱ्यांच्या पोटापाण्याचे प्रश्न सोडवण्याकरतां होते. ह्या माझ्या सांगण्यावरून बादशाहाचें राज्य उलटवण्याच्या कटाचा माझ्यावर जो आरोप करण्यांत आला आहे त्याबद्दल मी अगदीं निर्दोष आहे. म्हणून कोर्टांनीं मला सोडून द्यावें. ह्या कटांतील बाहेरच्या लोकांशीं माझा कोणताही संबंध नव्हता व त्रय्यवहार कोणाशीं केला नव्हता. व गुप्त कारस्थानही कोणाशीं केलें नाहीं. मुंबईचे पांच सहा लोक होडले तर कटांतील बाकी कोणत्याही लोकांशीं माझी पूर्वी ओळखही नव्हती. त्या मुंबईच्या पांच

सहा लोकांची ओळख होण्याचें कारण मी पूर्वी सांगितलेंच आहे. श्री. आळवे हे त्यांना गि. का. युनि यनमध्ये घेऊन आले. जर आळवे ह्यांनी त्यांच्याविषयी सात्री दिली नसती तर आमच्या गिरण कामगारांच्या चळवळीत तरी त्यांचा शिरकाव झाला नसता. कारण आमच्या गि. का. महामंडळाचा अस नियमच होता की, बाहेरची कोणीही मंडळी आपल्या युनियनमध्ये घ्यावयाची नाहीत. पण श्री. आळवे यांनी त्यांना आणलें व हे चांगले शिकलेले, देशभक्त, कामेसभक्त आहेत असे सांगितलें व तें सरीही आहे कारण, अजूनपर्यंत ते कामेसचे मेंबरही होते. पण येथें आल्यावर पहातों, तर सर्वच प्रकार उलट. कोर्ण म्हणतो, मी 'कॅम्प्युनिस्ट' कोण म्हणतो मी 'मार्क सिझम' कोण म्हणतो मी 'जर्मनिझम' तर कोर्ण म्हणतो मी 'फॅसिनिझम' ज्यावेळीं ते पकडले गेले व आम्ही मीरतला आलों तेव्हां बहुतेक सादीभक्त होते. येथे कै. वा. मोतीलाल नेहरू, जवाहिरलाल, सरोजिनी नाथडू, महात्मा गांधी बगैरे मंडळी त्यांना भेटावयाला आली होती व शक्तीप्रमाणें त्यांनी डिफेन्सकरतां मदतही केली, पण आतां स्टेटमेंटच्या वेळीं पहातों त सर्वच उलट, सर्वांनाच शिब्या.

कोणत्याही बेकायदेशीर संस्थेशीं माझा संबंध नाही. मी आतांपर्यंतचे माझे आयुष्याचे दिवस गिरणीमध्ये घेताच प्रश्न सोडविण्याकरतां बारा चौदा तास काम करून घालवीत असें व मिळेल ती कोरटी भाकर खाऊन अर्धपोटी कसेबसे आयुष्याचे दिवस काढीत असें; पण हे मुंबईचे पांचसहा लोक संपात आले तर कोठें गुप्त कट तर कोठें लेनिनिझम तर कोठें कॅम्प्युनिझम तर कोठें मार्सनिझम तर कोठें फॅसिनिझम तर ह्यांच्या या अशा गुप्त कारस्थानांत माझा कोणताही संबंध नाही, इतकेंच सरें. यांनी आमच्या कामगारांच्या संपात घेऊन उलट एकच केले. सर्व मागण्या मिळावयाच्या बाजूलाच राहिलें, पण अडीच वर्षे माझ्यासारख्या गरीब कामगाराला मीरतच्या जेलमध्ये घेऊन कुंथावें लागलें. ह्या माझ्या एकंदर हकीकती- वरून आपल्या सहज लक्षांत येईल की, मी कोण होतों व माझे विचार काय असतील हे जाणण्याकरतां एसादा तज्ज्ञ पंडित नको आहे, आपण आज दोन वर्षे ह्या सटल्यांतील बारीक निरीक्षण करीत आहांत, तेव्हां माझे बाबतींत कटाचा संबंध किती आहे हें आपल्या लक्षांत आलें असेल. ह्या माझ्या मुंबईच्या मित्रांनी मला बाहेर छळलें तें छळलें, पण तुरंगांतही छळण्यास कमी केले नाही. असल्या लोकांच्या नादीं माझ्या कोणच्याही कामगार बंधूनें लागूं नये अशी माझ्या सर्व कामगारबंधूना मी नम्र विनंति करतो आणि माझे स्टेटमेंट संपवितों.

जजसाहेबानीं माझ्या केसच्या बाबतींत बारीक विचार करून पाहिल्यास मी कटाच्या बाबतींत कसा गोंवलों गेलों हें सहज कळून येण्यासारखें आहे. व बारीक विचार करणें ईश्वर त्यांस बुद्धि देवो अशी प्रार्थना करून माझे स्टेटमेंट मी पुरें करतो.

प्रश्न:— साक्षीदार देणार काय ?

उत्तर:— साक्षीदारावांचून कोर्टाला न्याय, अन्याय निवडतां येईल.—(समाप्त) 15-9-31

कासले (चारू)

प्रश्न:—तुमची जबानी तुम्हांस आतां वाचून दाखवली आहे व तुमच्या सांगण्याप्रमाणें तींत तुरुस्त्या केल्या आहेत तरी ती आतां बरोबर असल्याबद्दल तुमचें समाधान झालें आहे काय ?

उत्तर:— होय.

16-9-31. सही.— गोविंद रामचंद्र कासले.

Certified that the above is a full & true account of accused's statement taken in my presence & hearing & subsequently read over to accused & corrected as requested by him & finally admitted by him to be correct.

(Sd.) R. L. YORKE.

16-9-31.

In the Court of R. L. Yorke Esq. Addl. Sessions Judge Meerut.

In the case of King, Emperor Vs. P. Spratt and others Examination of Kishori Lal Ghosh accused under section 342 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1898, made before me R. L. Yorke I.C.S. Addl. Sessions Judge at Meerut on the 10th day of June 1931.

My name is Kishori Lal Ghosh; my father's name is Nanda Lal Ghosh; I am by caste Kayasth, I do not believe in caste; 36 years of age; by occupation Journalist and lawyer; my home is at Calcutta, Police Station Shiam Pokhra, district Calcutta, I reside at 1 Kantapukur Lane Calcutta.

Q. You heard your statement to the Lower Court P. 2599 read out on 16. 3. 31. Is that statement correct?

A. Yes; with one exception. In explaining my Manifesto to Jamshedpur workers I had said that "certain words and phrases bore some resemblance to those one frequently comes across in Inprecorr, in the same way as I resemble in some of my habits the members of the Third International who I presume take boiled eggs with their tea and toast." The learned Magistrate failed to record the last part of the sentence altogether and though the learned Junior Public Prosecutor in his summing up said, "Mr. Ghosh said something about eggs and the Third International," the Magistrate wrote in his Committal Order "Kishori Lal Ghosh admits that the language of the Manifesto was inspired by inprecorr." I may mention here that it could not have occurred to me at all to refer to the Inprecorr in connection with my explanation of P 36 if the Prosecution had not suggested that some of the words and phrases often used in English language were the monopolies of the Communists and when used by any of the accused in the dock must be taken to bear a very sinister meaning. That this suggestion of the Prosecution has been accepted by the learned Magistrate is apparent throughout the Committal Order and nowhere so glaringly conspicuous as where he dealt with my case individually.

Q. The following documents relate to what may be called your European connections so far as they have any apparent bearing in this case: P 30, 167, 153, 72 (1), 79, 526 (29), 76, 2008P, 2419P, 2255P, 2429, 2430 series, 1516, 1517, 1518, 1519, 2431 series, 1530, 1531, 2116; P2001 & 2002, P2189 and P526 (13). Have you anything to say about this evidence?

A. The learned Magistrate has found that I was "an affiliated member of the L. R. D. late in 1928 and presumably had been earlier" and that I was "working in a team with Dange and Spratt under it." As far as I could see, though the Magistrate does not

mention it, P 2255P is his basis for holding that I was an affiliated member while his inference of my team work with Dange and Spratt has been drawn from P 2419 out of which he quotes an extract. Let me at the very outset say that I was never an affiliated member of the L. R. D. nor was there ever any question of working in a team with Dange and Spratt. As a matter of fact I did not know at all that Dange had anything to do with it (L. R. D.). I met Dange in February 1928 at Delhi where I had gone in connection with the Executive Council meeting of the A. I. T. U. C. but he did not tell me anything about it. Nor did Spratt inform me later on in Calcutta when I discussed with him my ideas about a Bureau which should primarily concern itself in the investigation of problems arising out of the relations between Labour and Capital.

The facts briefly stated are these: as the Secretary of the Press Employees Association, Vice President of the Kankinara Labour Union and Secretary of the B. T. U. F. I had on many occasions to meet and discuss with the management of the various industries terms of settlement for the calling off of strikes. On these occasions I used to meet smiling and very courteous gentlemen who professed great sympathy for the workers and with a candour which disarmed criticism would express their inability to give any relief to them because, they would say, in this age of hard competition it would harm, if not be suicidal to, the industries concerned. With a rapidity that was bewildering some of them would snatch a piece of paper and scribble out figures to show that the limit had been reached and that whatever they did or were going to do was the only thing to do under the circumstances—be it a reduction of wages, of Khoraki, or reductions of hands. It was useless to point out to them the past profits or dividends paid by those concerns even when supported by the latest figures as published in the Press. "Oh! those were good old days", they would generally exclaim, "but the Industry is passing through a crisis and we who have got to face the music only know what we are in for."

There was also another reason. The workers having practically no representatives in the Legislature, interpellations have got to be made through gentlemen who, whatever may be, their other qualifications, could not be expected to be very well posted with regard to the needs and grievances of the workers in particular industries. The official answers to interpellations are generally so studiously vague that they are almost useless unless followed by searching supplementary questions which from their very nature require a thorough knowledge of the subject on the part of those who put these questions. I need not dilate on the

obvious usefulness of well conducted investigation with a view to educate the public in general as to the claims of Labour to a just proportion of what it produces--whatever may be the controversy regarding the exact proportion to which Labour and Capital are respectively entitled even at the present state of society based as it is on individualism.

In other words I wanted a bureau for the study of economics with a view to analyse the working of every industry, the productive capacity of the worker, the market value of what he produces, the cost of what he produces and the proportion his wages bear to the cost and the market value of the product. I wanted a bureau for a comparative study of the productive capacity of the workers of different countries, the cost of living in those countries and the standard of living as well as the wages paid. It was inevitable that I should feel the need for such a bureau particularly because the Government is apathetic in this respect and the powerful employers' organisations formed to safeguard their interests cannot be expected to collect and publish facts and figures which would certainly not improve the case they always seek to make out against the workers in turning down their demands. If workers' representatives have to meet the employers on the platform of argument they must be thoroughly equipped for the job. If the pressure of public opinion is to be enlisted in favour of the workers in their endeavours for the betterment of their economic conditions the public should not be allowed to look at only one side namely the employers' side of the shield. The public should also have the opportunity to look at the other namely the workers' side of the shield.

When Spratt visited Calcutta in March 1928 in connection with the Trade Union Inquiry I broached the subject to him in one of our very first meetings. As a matter of fact I considered Spratt to be the fittest man available to help me in this matter as he was connected with the L. R. D., which fact was known to me as early as the middle of 1927 when Mr. N. M. Joshi had sent me a printed appeal similar to P 230. The very name of this body, (the L.R.D) though I knew nothing about it at the time, was enough to encourage me in the idea that Spratt's experience and knowledge about the working of this body would be of help to me in starting the bureau for the objects I had in view. I told him my idea and asked him whether he would read a paper on the subject in a public meeting that I intended to call under the auspices of the B.T.U.F. He said he would write something about it for me but did not take very kindly to the idea of reading it in a public meeting. On my next meeting with him I asked him what he had done about

it. He said he had not been able to do much about it but that he intended to give it to me by a certain date. I reminded him again (P5:6 (20)). But he actually gave it to me or rather sent it to me through the post in about June from Ondal (I am not sure about the month). I am sorry I could not find it amongst articles recovered from my search, otherwise I would have produced it before the Court. As far as I can remember the paper sent to me was very similar to the one which has been recovered from the European Asylum Lane and has been put in by Spratt as D-92.

My next step in the matter was to write to the L. R. D. requesting that some of the reports with a copy of the rules etc. may be sent to me. Four issues of the periodical called "Monthly Circular" published by it were sent along with some booklets, while no rules and constitutions of the body nor its annual reports were sent. I was informed in a letter that the minimum affiliation fee was £1 per year and that both persons and organisations can be affiliated. I wrote another letter thanking it for the literature received but repeating my requests for rules and constitutions and annual report. This was about August or September. There the matter ended as I had my hands full with Bauria strike and ^{the}conduct of several cases arising out of it besides my other activities. It was here that I learnt for the first time about P 2255P which on the very face of it seems to be a Bill and not a receipt made out in the name of the B.T.U.F. Beyond the Inquiry about affiliation and ^{the}actual working of the organisation as stated before there was, as far as I remember, nothing in my letter which could warrant the sending of a Bill. This is, as far as I gather, an instance of a laudable attempt to extend the clientele of the organisation. Perhaps it did not occur to the sender of the Bill that the organisation sought to be affiliated must first of all apply for the same, acquainting itself with the rules and constitution of the body to be affiliated with. The Secretary of no organisation can affiliate it to another organisation without the full and formal concurrence of its Executive, if not of the whole body of its members. I consider it necessary to add that in my correspondence with the L.R.D. I used the B. T. U. F. note-paper which is to be found amongst exhibits. I may also add that after Spratt gave to me the paper or prospectus referred to above I had no talk with him on the matter. In this connection I cannot help remarking that it seems to me rather unusual that the bill should be sent without any covering letter, particularly in view of the circumstance that it was being sent to an organisation which had not formally applied nor had expressed its desire to be so affiliated, beyond what can be inferred from the inquiries the nature of which has been stated above. But perhaps I am doing the L. R. D. an injustice. It might have sent a covering letter, on the ultimate

fate of which as of the original bill perhaps the Police more than anybody else can throw some light.

Before I leave the subject I must say that I had no idea about the character, constitution and personnel of this organisation. Its name as I have said before so obviously indicates its functions that I believed it to be a non-party organisation of the character I wanted to see up, devoted to re-search work in the interest of the working class. It is necessary to point out in this connection that an English Journalist of the knowledge, experience and eminence of Mr. Wilson was no less surprised in his editorial chair at the Pioneer office, ~~then~~ I was in the dock when the late Mr. Langford James included in the list of the organisations supposed to have conspired against His Majesty the name of this body. Mr. Wilson wrote a short leaderette in the Pioneer dated the 5th August 1929 which got him into trouble, of which I quote the following relevant extracts:—"It is rather surprising to find the L. R. D. among the list of organisations outside British India with which it is alleged that the accused in the Meerut Conspiracy Case have conspired. It is to be sincerely hoped that the Crown Prosecutor is not involving in his allegation the L. R. D. which is attached to the Labour Party's chief organisation in London. If he is, we are afraid we must point out—and we hope that in so doing we are in no way prejudicing his case—that he is casting aspersions upon one of the most respectable and perhaps the dullest section of the Labour Party. The L. R. D. fulfils for the Labour Party similar functions to those discharged by the Research Department attached to the Conservative Central Office. It gathers and supplies ammunition of facts and figures for the use of the candidates and for the propaganda of the party and no one has ever yet suggested that it has while discharging these duties brought itself within the law of conspiracy. Its staff has consisted of learned hard working economists who believe in Socialism, which is not yet an indictable offence. Two of its most distinguished members have been Mr. G. D. H. Cole, formerly a fellow Magdalen College, Oxford and now a fellow of the University College and University reader in economics, and Mr. Morris Dobb who is now University Lecturer in economics and politics at Cambridge. The Secretary of the department has been Mr. Arthur Greenwood, now minister of health, who was assisted by Mr. W. W. Henderson M. P. for Enfield and the son of the foreign Secretary. It is quite likely that they may have something to say later about the inclusion of the L. R. D. in a list side by side with the Third International and the Young Communist League."

In arguing the contempt case against Mr. Wilson in which this leaderette formed part of the subject matter, the late Mr.

Langford James did not challenge the facts stated there. But even if he had, it would not have affected my contention which is this that an Englishman and a journalist having considerable knowledge of the public bodies functioning in England had an idea of this body similar to my own, namely that it is exactly what it purports to be from its name.

I may further remark that it was not till June 1929, about three months after our arrest, that the British Trade Union Congress in its annual session at Belfast endorsed after a prolonged and heated discussion the report of the committee appointed by itself the previous year to inquire into the disruptive elements in the Labour Movement—the report containing an account of the L. R. D. which thoroughly surprised many of the British Trade Unionists who by no stretch of imagination can be called Communists or said to have, to quote the words of the learned Magistrate “leanings towards Moscow”. I have already shown in my cross-examination of Mr. Brailsford and propose to show further that many of the biggest Trade Unions, conducted on the most orthodox lines with such office bearers as Mr. Purcell and Mr. Henderson or Mr. Thomas, were affiliated up to 1928 if not to the present day with this body. In the course of the debate on the report referred to above Mr. Citrine the General Secretary of the British Trade Union Congress supporting the adoption of the report said “We there (in the report) say the foregoing facts want rather drawing the attention of affiliated Unions to the activities of this organisation. No-where in this report do we condemn the L. R. D. as a Communist organisation. No-where in this report do we denounce those Trade Unionists who have been connected with the L. R. D. All that we say in fact is “There are certain Communist connections in our opinion here. You affiliated unions, examine the subject for yourselves and satisfy yourselves that everything is above board”. That is what we say and I suggest to you we have grounds for saying so.” So that was the position of the British Trade Union Congress even as late as June 1929 after this case had begun.

MY RELATIONS WITH SUMENDRA NATH TAGORE.

The learned Magistrate finds my correspondence with Soumyendra Nath Tagore “suspicious”: Tagore went to Berlin, he says, “as a professed Communist—he was on the Executive of the old C. P. I.—and there joined forces with the Berlin group such as Nambiar (P 2008). He corresponded with Kishori Lal on such subjects as affiliation of the Trade Union Congress to the Internationals; he informed him that he had sent money to Muzaffar Ahmad and Dange to subsidise labour papers, and offered to get some money for him for the same purpose, the

exposure of the exploitation of the masses and the repression practised by the Government (P. 76). The very fact that Tagore had to give an accommodation address P. 72 (1) care of Miss Agnes Smedley should have seemed remarkable", and to complete the catalogue of my crimes I happened to have corresponded with Miss Agnes Smedley in connection with the press service between India and Berlin (P. 72 and 79) and so the learned Magistrate comes to the conclusion satisfactory to himself that I had connections with the continental group.

Now before I explain my connection with Tagore and Miss Smedley and the circumstances that led to the correspondence referred to I should like to say a word or two about "the Continental group". As far as I can gather from the evidence tendered by the Prosecution it seems both the Prosecution and consequently the Magistrate have a rather vague idea about what they call the Continental group and the evidence is equally vague. What is this Continental group with which I have been alleged to have "connections"? who are its members and what was the object for which this group was formed? I went carefully through the opening address of the late Mr. Langford James, the closing address of the learned junior Public Prosecutor of which I myself took copious notes, and the Committal Order of the learned Magistrate. But I found confusion, contradiction and vagueness surrounding all their references to it. The late Mr. Langford James studiously avoided the use of the expression, whereas the learned junior Public Prosecutor, less cautious, was definite that the Continental group consisted of M. N. Roy and Sipassi alias Mohammad Ali. Besides using the term in connection with my case the learned Magistrate used the term in pages 118, 179 and 198 of the Committal Order. In referring to Adhikari and Hutchinson he mentions the Berlin group of M. N. Roy and Nambiar on page 118. On page 197 he refers to Adhikari being in close touch with M. N. Roy and the Continental group. No-where has the Prosecution made any mention of Tagore and Miss Smedley belonging to the Berlin or Continental group, nowhere except when dealing my case has the learned Magistrate connected these two with the said nebulous group. The evidence tendered by the Prosecution on the other hand shows that Tagore had very little to do with it. The very exhibit namely (P 2008P) which the Magistrate relies upon for his inference that Tagore "combined forces with the Berlin group such as Nambiar" proves the very contrary, because of the contemptuous way in which Tagore refers to "a Madrasi named Nambiar" while finding fault with me for doing nothing in regard to the arrangements between Miss Smedley and Free Press about the press service and seems to be a little bit angry that that Madrasi should have come to a similar.

arrangement with the Free Press. But if Tagore mentioned Nambiar with a touch of indifference and contempt he himself is mentioned in the famous P 377, otherwise known as the Assembly Letter, in a way which, if the Letter itself is genuine as the Prosecution contends it is, suggests that Tagore far from belonging to the Group of which M.N. Roy is alleged by the Prosecution to have been the shining light and leading spirit was regarded with suspicion and Contempt. The whole paragraph has been devoted to him under the sub-heading "The representative of the W.P.P." ending with the suggestion that he should be expelled from the Central Committee of the C.P. if not from the party itself. So much for Tagore's connection with that vague entity called sometimes Berlin Group and sometimes the Continental Group. But Mr. Tagore's misfortune is to be misunderstood even by the party itself whose representative he claimed to be and for which as the Magistrate found he collected and tried to collect money of which fact again he wrote to me. Mr. Muzaffar Ahmad takes him to task for incorrectly giving the name of the Party and on another occasion demands whether the promised money has any other existence than in the imagination of Tagore, which naturally pains him a great deal.

There is a reference in P 2327 dated 2/6/27 in a letter by "M.A." to "Dear friend," bearing the Paris Post mark, to a long haired fellow who is called 'interesting'. I do not pretend to know who this interesting fellow might be. But if M.A. stands, as is suggested by the Prosecution, for Mohamimad Ali alias Sipassi and if from the wellknown fact that Tagore had long hair and left Calcutta for Europe in April it is to be inferred that he was the person referred to, the compliment seems to be of a doubtful character as applied to one by another engaged in a revolutionary conspiracy,—whatever may be its value in a lady's drawing room.

Interesting he was undoubtedly—so much so that very few people from what they saw of him in Calcutta would associate him with revolution, far less with a revolution leading to the Dictatorship of the Proletariat. He belongs to the Tagore family of Calcutta, and is the grandson of that grand old philosopher of Bengal late Dwijendra Nath Tagore, the elder brother of Rabindra Nath Tagore. I knew his father. Mr. Sudhindra Nath Tagore who was wellknown in Bengal for short stories, his pedestrian habits, as well as for his simple and unassuming manners, I knew him long before I came to know his son, of whom I heard for the first time in as far as I remembered about the middle of 1916 in connection with a benefit dramatic performance. The only revolutionary trait in his character at the time which created a

stir in Calcutta society and caused some controversy in some newspaper was manifested by an item in the programme, namely a dance by a girl of his family. This was the first time that a Bengali lady danced in public. What with this and what with the name itself which is rather rare I did not forget it when about six months later Donald Campbell introduced him and Muzaffar Ahmad to me on the very first evening he came out from Jail on bail. I was informed by Campbell that it was Muzaffar and Tagore, that with their joint efforts secured his release on bail and that Tagore stood as one of his sureties. I may mention in this connection that that was the first time I came in contact with Muzaffar, and his name sounded unfamiliar to me till he himself refreshed my memory by stating that he was one of the four who were convicted in the Cawnpore Conspiracy Case, but that he was let out before his time because he had developed Tuberculosis.

D/11-6-31.

However to come back to Tagore. In that first introduction I asked him his relationship with Rabindra Nath Tagore and he told me his father's name. Further explanation was necessary and I told him that I knew his father. I saw him for the second time in the Police Court on the day when Donald Campbell was taken in custody to Bombay and consequently Tagore's suretyship was discharged. I saw him for the third time at the Indian Association Hall where I accompanied Mr. Saklatwala at his own request as the latter had just finished his reply to the address given to him at the Wellington Square by the Bengal Trade Union Federation and the Press Employee's Association. I knew nothing about this function at the Indian Association Hall except what I learnt from the vague information supplied by Mrs. Santoshkumari Gupta, at one time the President of the Bengal Jute Workers' Association, who also accompanied Mr. Saklatwala, namely that it was something about the Conference of the Peasants and Workers. I had of course read in the papers some occasional notices of what I considered to be a newly formed party, re-organised from the defunct party known as the Labour Swaraj Party, with which I was indirectly acquainted through Mr. Hemanta Kumar Sarcar who had been interesting himself in the peasants' problems since 1923 when he had been an M. L. C. and was a member of the Swaraj party, which looked upon him as a sort of enfant terrible. I came to Mr. Sarcar in the course of my duties as a Journalist connected with the Forward, the organ of the Swaraj Party. There at the Indian Association Hall I saw for the second or third time Mr. Muzaffar Ahmed and also Mr. Tagore who read out the address on behalf of the Conference. A few days after

Mr. Tagore paid me a call and we had some talk about the Trade Union Movement and the unfortunate differences that had retarded progress of the movement. Now that the other party had practically ceased to exist after the T. U. C. Executive meeting in December 1926, he hoped that I would strengthen the organisation etc.:. He modestly hinted that he too was working for Labour and then for the first time told me that he was shortly going to Europe for study. A few days after during my morning walk I returned his visit out of courtesy and there I was informed that his date of sailing had been fixed and that he would study in Germany, though he intended to travel in England and France as well. I told him that if he could spare time he might maintain correspondence with me and write to me about his experience in these countries particularly with reference to political and Labour conditions in which I was naturally interested both as a Journalist and as a Trade Unionist. I came away and two or three days after received a note at home saying that he came to see me but could not find me and invited me to a social gathering of some of his friends to meet him. I could not attend because of previous engagement and this I informed him in a letter wishing him a safe voyage. These are the facts about my relations with Sumendra Nath Tagore.

Not having the resources of the C. I. D. I never knew that he was a professed Communist or that ^{he} was a member of the Executive Committee of the Communist Party in India. Though in fairness to myself I must say that even if I did know that would not have prevented me from having the relations that I had with him. On the other hand, those who knew Tagore at the time, would bear me out that in outward appearance he surpassed even an out and out Gandhite. Clad in the thickest of hand-spun Khaddar available he used to go about bare-footed. I did never in the course of our conversations hear anything that would have led me to suppose that he was in any way different from hundreds of young men, intensely Nationalistic in outlook, loyal to the Congress, but at the same time dissatisfied with its lack of any definite policy and programme which by enlisting the sympathy and support of the masses would make it in fact as it was in theory truly a National organisation. He had very little idea about the practical problems facing the Trade Union Movement or about the conditions of the working class. He had a clearer knowledge about the needs of the peasantry which he had greater opportunities of studying because the Tagore family had extensive Zamindari. That is how I saw Tagore before he left India.

In this connection I may also add that the fact that Muzaffar

and Tagore were taking such an interest in Campbell did not strike me as strange. It was quite natural for the Indians to do the little that they could for an Englishman who came to India and got into trouble for associating with the public activities of this country. The sympathy and support accorded both to Spratt and to Johnstone by Indians of all shades of opinion would bear out what I have said. It must be mentioned that before Campbell was arrested he had rather prominently been mentioned in the newspapers for his participation in the Executive Council meeting of the A. I. T. U. C. in December 1926.

Now I come to the correspondence between me and Tagore. As far as I remember it was Tagore who first wrote to me and in reply I enclosed a few copies of the circular letter that I had addressed to the Press in India on the need of sending a delegation to China (D 180) requesting him to distribute them, if possible, to the various newspapers and news agencies and also to help me procure materials about China which would enable me to draw up a scheme as requested by a number of Journalists who approved of my idea. It was at this stage that Miss Smedley came into the picture. Tagore wrote to me that his friend Miss Smedley, herself a Journalist, had been spoken to on the Subject and she had kindly undertaken to supply me with as much information as she could collect. She also wrote to me the same effect. She gave me in two letters detailed information about the cost of living in China, laying particular emphasis that the Journalists, if they wanted to collect correct and first hand information, must pick up Chinese, and reassured me that it was not such a formidable task as would appear at first sight. Subsequently in the process of time, that is, within a few months from the date of my circular letter the situation in China settled down almost to a stalemate and I had to give up the project, the reasons for which I had given in D 175 in my opening statement to the All India Press Conference held on January 1st 1929. But the idea of setting up a Bureau for the supply of correct information about what was happening outside to the Indian public, and to supply to the public outside India through foreign news agencies correct news about India, was not given up by me. I continued to correspond with Miss Smedley at Berlin and Mr. Pulin Behari Seal of the Oriental News Service in London. My idea was this that the Indian Journalist's Association with the help of the Press in India would set up a News Bureau which would supply Indian news to the Foreign Press or news agencies in exchange for foreign news. This latter the association would circulate amongst the papers in India until they realise the importance and value of such service as supplementary to Reuters. Subsequently when the Bureau would be in working order it would be handed over to an Indian news agency under certain

conditions, of which one was that a certain number of young men recommended by the I. J. A. should be taken by the Bureau on probation for qualifying them as sub-editors, and that the Editorial Board of the Bureau should have an effective representation from the association. An idea of what I had in mind may be gathered from the letter I wrote to Miss Smedley in reply to her letter requesting me to recommend her to the Free Press in regard to this project of News Bureau. Of course I did not, whatever my own scheme was, like to stand in the way of her direct communication with the Free Press, and as a matter of fact I did request Mr. Sadanand, the Managing Director of the Free Press, to take her as a correspondent and I believe he did something for her. Shortly after my return to Calcutta from Delhi in February 1928 I wrote to Miss Smedley about it. I may add here that there are few Journalists in India who do not know Miss Smedley by reputation or have not read her articles contributed to the "People" founded by the late Lala Lajpat Rai of Lahore, the "Forward" founded by the late C. R. Dass, the "Modern Review" founded and edited by Mr. Ramanand Chatterji and last but not the least "Amrit Bazar Patrika" with which I was connected up to the day of my arrest, the 20th March, 1929. All my relations with Miss Smedley were purely in connection with my activities as a Journalist and Secretary of the Indian Journalists Association.

To come back to Tagore again, I notice that except three none of the letters, which as far as I can remember, can not be more than half a dozen on either side in total that passed between us, have been put in by the prosecution. Now, if Tagore had left India as such a dangerous character as a professed Communist is in the eyes of the Police, with whom even to carry on correspondence is suspicious, it is quite legitimate to suppose that the watchful Police were interesting themselves in the contents thereof. There was such a thing as a camera as early as 1927 and type-writer, pen and ink were not very scarce. How is it therefore that manuscript, typed or photographed copies of all these letters passing between us were not put in by the Prosecution before the Court to enable it to judge the exact character of my relations with Mr. Tagore and incidentally with Miss Agnes Smedley? I hope the Prosecution in due time will answer the question. The Intercepting Officer (P. W. 97) produced a photographic representation of one letter (P. 2008 P) and two letters recovered from my possession in the search, addressed by Tagore to me, were put in and one draft copy of a letter (P 79), some pages of which seemed to have been mixed up with another draft letter to Miss Smedley, had also been recovered. If P 79 is compared to D 212 it will be seen what a mess has been made of the whole thing by those who were entrusted by the

Prosecution with sorting out the various documents. Both P/79 and D 212 must have been of the same date, namely about the 7th February, because I find an entry in my diary (P 41) on the 9th February about a registered letter being sent to Tagore.

To come to the letters put in against me by the Prosecution. The learned Magistrate finds it remarkable that Tagore would give me what the Magistrate calls an accommodation address. The expression from the standpoint of lucidity leaves much to be desired, but if the Magistrate had meant by it that Tagore wanted to deceive the Police I think, as usual, he had drawn a hasty inference which he would not have drawn if he had cared to go through a letter from Tagore to Muzaffar Ahmad P. 2026 T dated the 17th January 1928, that is a fortnight later than the letter to me, where Tagore almost in identical language says that as letters miscarried far too often they should be directed to him c/o Agnes Smedley. I did not find the request remarkable at all. In the previous letters Tagore told me enough to indicate that though his permanent residence was at Berlin he was used to make short trips to various parts of Germany, and so I did not consider it unusual that he should give me the address of a friend to direct his letters to, so that he might be sure to get them when he came back. In this letter P 79 he asks from me "a nice detailed report about Trade Unions" containing also "a historical aspect of the movement and accounts of concrete particular Trade Unions" which he intended to circulate in my name to the Trade Union Conference which was to be held at Berlin about the end of February. I sent to him an article on the Trade Union Movement under a registered cover on the 9th February. A mention about this article is to be found in P 76 in which Tagore gives his views on the article and impresses on me the necessity of making known in Germany "in what terrible form exploitation is going on". He evidently expected my article to be of a denunciatory character rather than a presentation, as I sought to give, of facts about the Trade Union Movement in its early stage and the problems to be faced by those taking part in it. Subsequently all that I heard about it was that it was published in Berlin papers which he promised to send me (P 2008). Either Tagore failed to carry out his promise or they are now in the archives of the Police. I never had the satisfaction of seeing my article in German print. Here also I notice that the prosecution has failed to produce the original article.

P 76 already referred to is also a letter from Tagore dated 12th June 1928 and is extremely interesting for more than one

reason. Here he refers to two letters he wrote to me. Here again the Prosecution might have helped the Court in throwing as much light as possible on the character of my connection with Tagore. However the reference in this letter to a Left Wing paper reminds me that there was some correspondence going on for sometime about the need of a Labour paper. Tagore and I both agreed that there was need of such a paper but that was the only thing we agreed upon. The difference centred round the policy of the paper. I was for making it the organ of the Trade Union Movement in India - if not the actual organ of the A. I. T. U. C. The paper must be acting in the closest cooperation with the B. T. U. F. and deal with Labour problems from a non-partisan standpoint. But Tagore finding that my views were not in agreement with his began to approach the question from a different standpoint without letting me know in so many words that he did not agree with me. His reference to sending money to the Jute Workers' Association at Bhatpara and the Textile Workers' Union at Bombay for starting papers was construed by me at the time, and I am still of the same opinion, that he wanted to convey to me the idea that he stood for several papers to be started for different Industries and those unions which would be prepared to cooperate with, if not to get themselves affiliated with the Workers' and Peasants' Party would have the conduct of these papers. I was confirmed in this impression gathered from the letter further by the fact that the Bengal Jute Workers' Association which kept itself more or less aloof from the Bengal Trade Union Federation had invited the W. P. P. to hold its annual session at Bhatpara and the Bengali Annual Report of that Party spoke in exceedingly flattering terms about the Union and its membership. That I was not wrong in thus construing his meaning would appear from P 2027 where Tagore writes to Mr. Muzaffar Ahmad that he had already written to Kali Das Babu explaining that his paper was to be published by the Party.

However much I liked to correspond with Tagore and discuss with him all sorts of problems in connection with labour, I had kept one point in view, as I did in all my activities, and it is this that as the Secretary of the Provincial Committee of the A. I. T. U. C. I should never allow any outside body or person to dictate to it its policy and programme. I had made it clear in my letters that in the present stage of the Labour Movement the need for a central organ in cooperation with the central body representing the Labour Movement, discussing the various problems of Labour and organisation, and containing the news of the Movement at home and abroad is more urgent

than a sectional organ which would be of interest only to a limited number of workers, the number being very small in view of the appalling illiteracy amongst them. So with all his kind assurance to help the Press Employees' Association and his request to me not to hesitate to "utilise" him, I found that in our various discussions on the Labour-Movement now that we were beginning to face concrete problems—our difference in outlook was becoming clearer and clearer.

This was further manifested in the discussion about the affiliation of the T. U. Movement to outside organisations. In the meeting of February 1928 of the Executive Committee of the T.U.C. at Delhi this question was postponed. But I gave my views on it in a letter to Tagore wherein I said that I stood out against the affiliation of the T. U. C. either with the Amsterdam or the Moscow International. I do not remember exactly the reasons I gave for this attitude but the words I used in this connection have been quoted by Tagore in his reply dated 1st August 1928 P 2008P namely that "it is suicidal to tie the Indian Trade Union Movement to the tail of the Second or Third International". As I shall have to say something on this in connection with my speeches in some of which the learned Magistrate has discovered traces of a leaning towards Moscow, I do not say anything now except this that whereas hitherto Tagore was indulging in vague idealism and denunciatory language in describing the conditions of the workers in this country, which must have appeared to him particularly shocking when he compared their condition with that of the workers in Europe, as soon as such specific and concrete problems as that of a Labour organ or the affiliation of the Trade Union Congress began to be discussed our difference in views came to be accentuated. If the learned Magistrate had had the patience to go through carefully even the three letters which the Prosecution chose to place before him and compare them with those that passed between Tagore and Muzaffar Ahmad, he would have found that the correspondence with me was rather between two friends who differ in their views and outlooks though both were interested in the Labour Movement, whereas in the other case it was entirely different in tone and character. Tagore goes on discussing with me at length about the ways and means of starting Labour papers but he straightway sends money to Muzaffar and Dange. He asks me to put him in touch with the different unions affiliated to the Federation so that he might know all about the Movement in the different Industries and have a mandate from them. But he must know exactly the policy on which I wanted to conduct the paper which was to act as the central organ before he tried to procure money from Germany. He was perfectly within his rights to do so.

But I have to bring out these obvious facts because they seem to have escaped the learned Magistrate in his laborious search for truth. And yet these facts emerge unmistakably, in spite of all the bright promise held out of the country being flooded with Labour papers representing such leading unions as Jute, Textile, Seamen, Railwaymen, Post and Telegraph and even Press Employees "subject to the central organ of the Federation". The prospect was dazzling but the policy must be made clear, so that those who would send the money might be satisfied that it was a policy worth spending money for. This was not necessary in the case of Muzaffar and Dange for reasons too obvious to be mentioned. The learned Magistrate, who found my use of the terms 'solidarity' and 'Workers of the World Unite' as significant, did not find anything unusual or to quote his own word significant in this insistent request for a definition of policy or in Mr. Tagore's earnest endeavours to prove to me that his remedy to deliver the Indian Labour Movement from Messrs. Joshi, Chaman Lal, Andrews and others whom he elegantly described as "toadies to Reformist Capitalists" was the best one, his heart-felt desire that I should accomplish the hard task of keeping the Movement in the fighting line, and his efforts to get over my reluctance of foreign control by assuring that the donors did not intend to control the Movement—all these did not strike the Magistrate as significant or indicate the character of our connection, namely Tagore trying to convert me to his views in the heart to heart discussion conducted between two friends having mutual esteem but different in their outlook on matters of common interest, that is the Labour Movement in India.

D/- 12. 6. 31.

By Court:— The accused requests the Court at this stage to add to the question the references showing connection with J. W. Johnstone of the League against Imperialism and Donald Campbell. I therefore add to the question the references, which are :— P 84, 526 (7), 526 (9), 27, 2224, 26, 41 to 47, 80, 81, 1999, 77, 50, 1354 (3) and 33.

A. My connection with Harry Pollit and William Paul:—"In addition to this" (that is, team work with Dange and Spratt under the L. R. D.), observes the learned Magistrate, ' Kishori Lal was in correspondence with Harry Pollit of the National Minority Movement and quite clearly approved of the 'Worker and Sunday Worker'. The Magistrate only refers to P 30 which is a draft letter to Mr. Harry Pollit recovered in search from my house. But he also might have referred to two other exhibits in this connection, namely P 167 which is dated 3rd August 1927 and is a message of good will and best wishes conveyed by the National Minority Movement through

its Secretary to the All India Press Employees' Conference, and P 168 which is dated 5th August 1927, also a letter of the same character addressed by Mr. William Paul, editor, Sunday Worker, to me as the Hony. Secretary of the all India Press Employees' Conference. Before I proceed to explain the character of the correspondence with Mr. Harry Pollit I should first invite your attention to the opening sentence in the draft letter which is to the effect that a letter of Mr. Harry Pollit dated 17th June was received by me on the 11th July. From the internal evidence it seems that the letter must have been drafted and sent somewhere in the middle of July 1927. In view of the disclosures made by the numerous C. I. D. officers in this Court about the interception of letters coupled with the delay referred to in the receipt of the letter under reply, it is legitimate to conclude that the letter must have passed through the hands of the ever watchful Police. But that letter has not been produced by the Prosecution. If it were produced it would have been found to be a reply to my letter which I first wrote to Mr. Pollit in about May, simultaneously with those I wrote to various other organisations including the British Trade Union Congress and the Secretariat of the International Federation of Trade Unions, as would be evident from the reply of the latter body in D 236. I just incidentally mention this because, if my first letter to Mr. Harry Pollit and his reply to it were produced by the Prosecution, the character of my correspondence would have been even clearer than it is, and would have "clearly proved" the reverse of what the learned Magistrate infers from the draft found in my possession.

I shall here state briefly the circumstances which led to the correspondence. The B. T. U. F. was rent asunder by serious disputes in the early part of 1926, as referred to in my statement in the Lower Court in connection with Donald Campbell, which continued practically throughout the year. At the Executive Council meeting of the A. I. T. U. C. held in December at Calcutta the party which started the quarrel was defeated and the beginning of the year 1927 found the Federation settling down quietly to the task of consolidation and re-organisation. A sound policy which would bring to this body the support of the maximum number of Trade Unions and Trade Unionists was necessary. It was necessary that I, its Secretary, should have a thorough knowledge of the workings of the well-established Unions abroad, particularly of England—and the policy on which they worked, how Federations are formed, their constitution, rules etc. Mr. N. M. Joshi the General Secretary of the A. I. T. U. C. helped me as far as it was possible in the matter by lending me from the Head Office at Bombay some literature on these matters. But I wanted more. I wrote to

Mr. Citrin, to Mr. Harry Pollit as well as to the International Federation of Trade Unions at Amsterdam with which I was already in communication as Secretary of the Press Employees' Association and which used to send the association regularly its News Bulletins, a large number of which was recovered from the search of both no: 1 Kantapukur Lane & 34 Boy Bazar Street. But while writing to them; I realised at the same time that all or even much of the literature that may be available from these bodies cannot be supplied without being paid for and the B. T. U. F. certainly was not able to afford the money. Being a Journalist naturally I hit upon the plan of supplying Labour news or contributing articles on Labour to the Labour Press abroad. This plan would not only enable me to give publicity to the Indian Trade Union Movement abroad but would also enable me to procure the literature necessary for getting an idea of the Movement abroad and the different currents and cross-currents in it of which I had a very vague idea from the news available in the British papers I had to read in the course of my Journalistic duties. It was not the money that I was so much keen about as the literature indicating the tendencies and the latest developments in the Trade Union Movement since after the War. I did send an article as "I hope to send" to Mr. Harry Pollit dealing with the fundamental problems a Trade Unionist in India has to grapple with. But I heard nothing about it, nor, as is the usual Journalistic custom, was any copy of the paper in which it was, if it was at all, published, sent to me. Either the article did not reach its destination or it was not published. At any rate in view of the disclosures made in this court about the thorough character of the system of interception it is fair to infer that either the original article or a copy of it was in the hands of the Police, which was either not supplied to the Prosecution or the Prosecution did not for reasons of their own put it in as an exhibit. I make particularly pointed reference to this, as the article itself would have given a clear indication as to the character of the problems which faced me as a Trade Unionist. It would further have shown with what outlook I approached these problems.

The learned Magistrate, as on certain other occasions in dealing with my case, is a little hasty in drawing the inferences he did, namely that I approved of the literature. What I actually said in thanking Mr. Pollit for sending me three pamphlets was that "I read all the three, especially the last, with great interest and profit". Certainly I did read them with interest and profit, because it enabled me to have an idea of the views entertained by one and that the minority section of the British Trade Union Movement. I set out to learn about the different points of view in this British Trade Union Movement and I picked up a lot of

information from these pamphlets. The question of approval in the sense of the acceptance of views did not arise at all. If, as the learned Magistrate lays down, one has to read with interest and profit only those books which he approves of the bounds of human knowledge would be exceedingly restricted. In the 3rd paragraph of the letter the position is made absolutely clear, leaving no room for doubt at least to those who without prejudice seek to find out the truth. I agreed to contribute to the paper on the Indian Trade Union Movement. I agreed to do so without payment but in exchange for the literature and periodicals connected with the Minority Movement, which as I have already said I wanted to study in order to gain a complete knowledge of the British Trade Union Movement as a whole. The same motive prompted me to carry on correspondence with the I. F. T. U. as well. To the I.F.T.U. organ I offered to supply news, whereas to Mr. Pollit I promised to contribute articles about the Trade Union Movement in India.

In carrying on the correspondence as I did with these organisations it never struck me that the condition precedent to the acceptance of articles in a particular paper, even though it be a party organ, is that the contributor should agree with or even approve of the views and policy of that paper. During the whole course of my Journalistic experience from 1920 to 1929 gained from my close connection with such leading Nationalist papers as the "Servant," the "Forward" and the "Amrit Bazar Patrika" I have never found that the choice and selection of articles or inviting of contributions has been solely or even mainly guided by the view expressed by the writer. The Indian Journalists have yet to learn that sense of journalistic fairness which made the London "Times" refuse to publish a protest and contradiction of the "facts" in Miss Mayo's "Unsubsidised" book called "Mother India" while giving these facts the widest publicity or opening its hospitable columns to the effusions of people like Sir Michael O'Dyer, and close its columns to eminent publicists like Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru or Munshi Ishwar Saran offering to remove certain mis-conceptions and prejudices that might be created in the minds of the British public due to these misstatements and half truths. Be that as it may, the whole thing summed up amounts to this. I wanted the literature of the Minority Movement as I already had some of the British Trade Union Congress from Mr. Joshi. I could not pay for the literature that I wanted, so I offered to give Mr. Pollit some articles on the Trade Union Movement in exchange for the literature of the Minority Movement. I do not know what became of the first which was also the last article I sent, nor do I know whether any further literature was sent to

me. The Police and the Prosecution could have enlightened the court on this point if they choose but they did not. However the correspondence ceased at this point.

The last paragraph of this letter suggests clearly again, that here there was no question of approval of the National Minority Movement views. The character, constitution and the personnel of the All India Press Employees' Conference was not such as to encourage one, who had according to the Magistrate approved of the views of the National Minority Movement, to invite Messrs. Tom Mann and Harry Pollit to send a message of good will and sympathy. As a matter of fact any one who approved of these views would neither have consented nor would have been elected to the Secretaryship of the Conference itself. As a matter of fact, as I propose to show later on, in the whole course of my conduct as a Trade Unionist I have tried to view the working class movement as a whole, while recognising the existence of different parties within it, but trying to find out a common platform on which all the parties could work together up to a certain point. My study of Indian conditions as well as the history of the origin and growth of the Trade Union Movement of Britain led me to consider this to be the soundest policy at the initial stage of the movement and guided my activities and policy throughout the period during which I was the Secretary of the B. T. U. F.

My relations with J. W. Johnstone.

I have already stated in the lower court the circumstances under which I became acquainted with J. W. Johnstone. The learned Magistrate however seems to have accepted these explanations with some amount of reservation. "Well", he says in effect, "you may have met him in your official capacity of the Secretary of the B. T. U. F. but it seems you got on well with him" and refers to P 1999P. The first evidence of my getting on well with Johnstone is of course that he could not pick up my correct name. He addresses me as Gosh whereas the envelope is directed to Mr. S. Gosh. The second fact in connection with this letter is that he requests me "if it is possible and not too much trouble" to trace his personal effects he left at Jharia when he was rather unceremoniously bundled out of it by the Police and send them to an address at New York. The third point is that he informs me that he purposely leaves out all politics so that those Government officials who might read the letter might let it go through to me. This last observation must have been the result of his hard experience, because in the very opening line of the letter he informs me that he

wrote three letters to me dealing with particulars of his case. He was quite right in inferring that if the letters had reached me my replies also would have reached him. But where are those three long letters? Why were they not produced before the court? All these points, which suggest themselves to one on reading P 1999 P, of course escaped the learned Magistrate.

In this connection I should also invite the attention of the Court that J. W. Johnstone was introduced to me by letter P 84 dated 25th November 1928 from Mr. P. C. Bose of Jharia—the Secretary of the Colliery Employees Union—who had gone to Geneva in 1928 as one of the advisers to the Delegation elected by the A. I. T. U. C. at Cawnpore, and attended the Commonwealth Labour Conference held in London as one of the representatives of the A. I. T. U. C. Further P 80 which was a cable addressed to Johnstone was handed over to me by Johnstone as his credentials sometime after he first came to me. Besides these, is another point. It was at the Gauhati Session of the Indian National Congress that Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru was elected to represent the Congress at the Brussels Session of the League, and it was on his report that the Indian National Congress at its Madras Session in 1927 agreed to become an associate member of the League. It will also be noted that Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru was elected at Brussels to be a member of the League Executive. Moreover if the learned Magistrate had given a cursory glance at P. 57, which is an issue of the "Sunday Worker" dated July 8, 1928, he would have found on the very first page and first column something which would not only have explained why I retained this particular issue in my possession but also he would have found some more facts which would have thrown some light on my relations with J. W. Johnstone as representing the League against Imperialism, which body got on very well with the Indian National Congress. I quote the relevant portion of a report of a meeting of the British section of the League from P 57: "..... fraternal greetings have been received from S. Iyengar, from the Indian National Congress (Mr. Srinivas Iyengar, Ex-Advocate General of Madras and the Ex-President of the Indian National Congress)Amongst those present on the platform was Mohammad Ali the veteran leader of the Mohammedan delegates."

Mr. Johnstone was not only the fraternal delegate to the A. I. T. U. C. but as he informed me he also had a mandate to represent the League at the Indian National Congress. In these circumstances I would have failed in my duty as the Secretary of the Provincial Committee of the A. I. T. U. C. if I did not do what I did, namely. taking him both to Chengail and to Bauria where unions had been organised under the direct mandate of the T. U.

Congress and through my efforts as its Provincial Secretary. I was only doing my routine duty in inviting Mr. Johnstone to a meeting of the Federation and introducing him to the representatives of the Unions as the fraternal delegate of the League to the A. I. T. U. C. The Magistrate might have, if he were so inclined, noted that there was some material difference in the character of my connections with Jack Ryan and those with Johnstone. J. Ryan came to me and introduced himself as the fraternal delegate to the T. U. C. from the Pan-Pacific Trade Union Secretariat. I certainly did not doubt his words, but I could not help noting that he brought no introduction from any one holding official position in the A. I. T. U. C. and did not show me any credentials. I contented myself in his case by inviting him to a meeting of the B. T. U. F., and had very little, certainly much less association with him than with Johnstone during his stay in Calcutta before the Congress. It seems to have struck the learned Magistrate as rather unusual that some members of the Workers and Peasants Party should have been present on that occasion at the Federation meeting and gives me the undeserved credit of "getting" the said members to meet Ryan. Here again, if the Magistrate had carefully gone through the records, namely P 1806P, he would have seen that J. Ryan had far better and more congenial hosts than my unworthy self, and he would certainly not have waited for me for introduction with the members of the Workers and Peasants Party in Calcutta. The presence in the Federation meeting of Messrs. Muzaffar Ahmad and Dharni Goswami is to be accounted for as being the office-bearers of Scavengers' Union and not as members of the Workers and Peasants Party as such, because in matters of general Labour interest and concern the office-bearers of Unions which were not yet affiliated were generally invited by the Federation. As for Spratt his official position as one deputed by the A. I. T. U. C. to collaborate with me in an enquiry into Trade Union affairs was too obvious to require any explanation of his presence at Federation meetings of this character.

D/- 13-6-31.

The prosecution suggests that the credit of affiliating the A. I. T. U. C. with the League against Imperialism belongs to some of the accused in the dock acting under definite instructions from abroad, namely that affiliation with the Third International or with the ~~Reds~~ ^{Reds} not being possible under the circumstances, the next best thing is to affiliate it with the League. Now, sir, I am always ready to give credit where credit is due, but to give credit where none is due is to deprive others to whom it is legitimately due. The credit for the enthusiastic support which the proposal for affiliation

received was due mainly to the Government which so unceremoniously deported Mr. J. W. Johnstone, the fraternal delegate of the League to the A. I. T. U. C., under an Act of 1866 or 1868 I forget which. The clause in the resolution passed in the Congress that it was for one year only would indicate the strength of the opposition which the proposal for affiliation would have met in case Government had departed from its traditional way of bringing about the very thing it seeks to avoid or prevent.

But it must also be admitted that besides the extreme Right Wing, who would not vote for affiliation with the League but were subsequently swept of their feet by the arrest of Johnstone, and those who must get it affiliated as they had been, as I understand from the Prosecution, instructed from their directing organisation abroad, there was a large volume of opinion in support of the affiliation mainly on the ground that the Indian National Congress had allowed itself to be on the list of the associate members of the League. Mr. Chaman Lal, who so resolutely opposed the affiliation of the T. U. C. with the Pan-Pacific Trade Union Secretariat, was disposed to look upon the League with benevolent eyes. Pandit Jawahar Lal though he said nothing either in favour of or against it, as every body knew, was himself a member of its Executive. Besides this, the sympathies which it is natural for the people of a dependent country struggling for its freedom to feel for a body with such a taking name were there. If the Government had not bungled, the discussion over this question would have been heated and prolonged and the Congress perhaps would have voted for affiliation, by a majority which may be called narrow. But the Government by its action set all controversy at rest.

In this connection I might point out a mistake, I hope it is not wilful, which the Prosecution has made throughout this case. To criticise Imperialism, to condemn it and to fight it in all possible and legitimate ways is not at all the monopoly of the Communists. The Communists have a deeper psychological insight into the minds of the people of a dependent country than the Government, and while or rather because they are fully alive to the fact that a people which, though averse to being dominated by another people, would yet refuse to accept the Communist programme, they seek to enlist their support primarily on this issue, namely an uncompromising fight against Imperialism. Now, in countries like England or France the Communists work under a great handicap, because the people there are not so much the victims of Imperialism but rather as the Capitalist Press led by Lord Rothermere and Lord Beaver-Brook points out, a gainer from it. Here the Communists of course, try to prove, as also do the Socialists, that properly

looked at, the benefits from the political and economic domination of one people by another people are less than the resulting injuries which are bound to make themselves felt in the long run. But human nature being what it is and the level of human understanding being what it is the people are disposed to look to the immediate benefits accruing from the domination of other people's territories than to the ultimate injuries that are bound to follow.

Now speaking for myself I may repeat, as I have said before, that "I am not a Communist but I am certainly against Imperialism. I do not believe in the possibility of one nation rendering service to another nation without reference to its own interests, immediate or ultimate. In support of this I need not go to philosophers like John Stuart Mill, but I find support in unexpected quarters and for that reason very convincing. In support of my views I refer to the campaign that is being carried on at present by the newspapers under the leadership of the coming Mousolini of England, namely Mr. Winston Churchill. Their sole theme is that to concede to India, the right to manage her own affairs unhampered by any other considerations than what is dictated by her own interests, needs and requirements is to lose India and to reduce England to a third-rate or it is sometimes said to tenth-rate power. One newspaper Lord also finds in the present conditions of Portugal a lesson for England, namely to lose your colonies is to lose all. Then again it is pointed out that out of every six, seven or eight persons in England one lives directly or indirectly on income derived from India. I certainly cannot submit to this curious logic of the robber who refuses to part with the booty on the plea that he would starve if he does so or that he would not be able to swagger about in the world as he used to do before on the strength of the fruits of his robbery. In the case of an individual this sort of argument is brushed aside with ridicule if not with contempt. But that a large number of English people take this argument seriously and support those who advance them is evidenced by the fact that Mr. Baldwin is being gradually elbowed out of his leadership of the party—not because he does not accept the principles underlying these arguments but because his cultured mind revolts at the way they are being advanced, stripped of all decent clothing with which they were hitherto covered, namely the muslin of the "sacred Mission" of Britain. It is very thin and fine and can be seen through but still it is a covering all the same, at any rate enough for short sighted people.

In order to avoid repetition I do not say any thing more here because I have to deal with it at some length in connection with the

learned Magistrate's discovery of my leaning towards Moscow. Here I am concerned only to show that a man need not be a Communist or even a pro-Communist to be anti-Imperialist. I go further and maintain that a man may be definitely anti-Communist and yet an uncompromising opponent of Imperialism. I further state that the large measure of support and sympathy which the League against Imperialism received from this country and also from the A. I. T. U. C. was due to the fact that it had enlisted the support of the Indian National Congress. That I am right would be proved in the near future because the League by its recent hasty actions in expelling Pt. Jawahar Lal Nehru from its Executive and removing from its list the name of the Indian National Congress is bound to alienate the sympathies support of all except perhaps the devout Communists.

Did Spratt use me as a cover address?

The learned Magistrate in his Committal Order on page 276 says, "There can be no doubt at all that he was on very intimate terms with Spratt in particular and with most of the Bengal accused. He allowed Spratt to make use of his address for letters. It should be made clear that it was not a cover address—in general letters were addressed to Spratt c/o Kishori Lal Ghosh, and the explanation he gives that Spratt's movements were so erratic that he wanted to be able to give a permanent address, is in itself plausible: there was no attempt, say, to deceive the Police. But it betokens close intimacy; and on, at any rate, two occasions C. P. Dutt used ^{him} as a real cover address for Spratt (P 2001, 2002) in both cases to ensure the safe delivery of a very important letter". The Magistrate's further remarks with regard to P 2001 and P 2002 are to be found on page 278 of the Committal Order "The first was sent in an envelope to Kishori Lal without any covering letter or an enclosed envelope and it contained Dutt's obviously code enquiries about Rhuden and Uke-Rhug (P2002). Such a letter could hardly strike the reader as innocent: yet it was sent in such a way that the addressee for whom it was not intended was very likely to read it through. It is almost impossible to believe that a letter of such importance would be sent exposed to the gaze of a casual acquaintance of Spratt who was not in the conspiracy. The other letter was the E. C. C. I. letter to the W. P. P. Here there was a covering letter asking Kishori Lal to pass it on, but again there was no inside envelope (P 2000). The same remarks apply with the addition that Dutt addresses him as 'Dear Comrade' and signs himself 'Yours fraternally' with the usual squiggle as his signature. The use of this signature alone suggests that Dutt is writing to an accomplice."

In this connection my statement to the Magistrate in reply to whether Spratt used me as a cover address should be taken into consideration—I said “when Spratt came to Calcutta for the first time he told me that his movements would be uncertain and that he had already sent my name and address to his home people to direct letters or to remit money c/o me. I made no objection to it. As far as I remember there was one letter which was addressed to me on the outer cover and had an inner cover addressed to Spratt. That letter was forwarded to him without opening. I never opened the letters sent to him save one telegram mentioned in the exhibits. Spratt’s first visit to Calcutta in 1927 was very short, but in 1928 after the meeting of the Executive Committee at Delhi he came to Calcutta at the instance of the A. I. T. U. C. as a member appointed by the Executive Committee of a sub-committee of which the other member was myself etc.....to inquire into the conditions of Trade Unions in Bengal. Now before I set about saying anything about the evidence tendered in regard to two letters in regard to which I was alleged to have been used as a cover address, I must beg leave of the Court to express my surprise that in spite of the remarks of the Magistrate quoted above and my statement bearing on the subject the late Mr. Langford James at the conclusion of his opening address in this court while summing up the cases of the individual accused should say with regard to me that I got “entangled” (I am quoting his very words) in this case as the cover addressee of Spratt.

Now let us see what P. W. 97 Sub Inspector Amarendra Kumar Sen said in cross-examination with regard to P 2002C: “I can not say why the letter P 2002 was copied while its envelope was photographed. I got Exh. P 2002 and P 2008 from the same Post Office intercepted on the same day. The order to copy both was from the Deputy Commissioner. I can not say on what system my superior officers ordered copying or photographing. There was nothing else inside the envelope P 2002PE except the actual letter. There was no second envelope inside it. I do not remember if I intercepted any other letter from a foreign country to Kishori Lal Ghosh that day. That envelope P 2002 P is certainly the envelope in which P 2002 was received and is not the envelope of any other letter. I have not got the substance of P 2002 in my notes. Leaving aside the copies I can not now remember the substance of the letter.” Before I proceed with further quotation of the deposition of this officer I should like to recall to your Honour’s mind that it was because of Mr. Sinha’s repeated questions as to whether there was an inside cover that Mr. Kemp went through the notes and pointed out to the witness that there was a mention of the inside cover and it was then and not till then that the witness

admitted: "I made a mistake in saying above that there was no second cover inside the original of P 2002P. I find from my notes that there was an envelope with the address on it at all. The letter to "Phillip" was inside that envelope addressed. Before returning the letter to the Post Master I put the letter inside the blank cover and put that inside the cover addressed to Ghosh. I can not remember if there was any writing apart from address on the inner envelope. I do not remember if it had on it the words 'for P. Spratt' or not." So it may be seen that the learned Magistrate was wrong in holding that the letter was "exposed" to my "gaze". As for his remark that this letter could hardly strike the reader as innocent, though this question does not arise in view of the reluctant and belated admission of the witness about a second inside cover, all that may be said, even admitting that I had read the contents, is that if experienced C.I.D. officers of the upper strata who are expected to know their job and the ramifications of all conspiracies, if they did not think the letter as of sufficient importance to take a photograph and were merely content with ordering a copy of it to be made, it is a little bit far-fetched to draw the inference as the learned Magistrate did against me. It should also be noted that the witness was not very sure or rather could not remember as to whether there was any writing on the inside cover though if his statement "apart from the address" is taken into consideration, this would show that there was the name of Spratt on the envelope. For the present I shall not take up other features connected with P 2002C, which has, as your Honour will remember, a rather chequered history and put the Prosecution to a lot of trouble because of the initials R. H.

Now in regard to P 2001, the first thing noticeable is that I had never had the opportunity, thanks to the zealous care of the Police, of dealing with it. It was detained in transmission. In view of the reluctant admission of P.W. 97, for which my thanks are due more to Mr. Kemp than to the officer with regard to P 2002C about the inside cover, I can not be sure as to whether the enclosure in P. 2001 was or was not in any other envelope directed to Spratt. But in this connection I can not help remarking that the learned Magistrate's inference from Mr. C. P. Dutt's use of squiggle in his letter to me is a little bit hasty if not far-fetched, because in going through the exhibits I find that this gentleman, if all the letters fathered by the Prosecution on him are really his uses his full name or squiggle in accordance with no consistent plan or principle, for less in consideration of the degree of the intimacy with or the confidence that he had in the addressee. He is guided rather by the whim of ^{the} moment or if I may say so by the exigency of the moment. In order to prove that my contention is based on facts, I would invite the attention of the Court to

several out of many such exhibits namely P 526 (44), a letter to "Dear Spratt" from "Yours C. P. Dutt;" P 526 (42), a letter to "Dear Phillip" by "Yours C;" P 1233, a letter to "Dear Mr. Mirajkar" from "Yours sincerely C.P. Dutta," and P 1348 (34) to "Dear Ghate" from "Yours fraternally C. P. Dutt". There are some more documents of nature.

Now, Sir, I am rather averse to advancing any theory as to what might have been the intentions of Mr. C. P. Dutt to write to me for the first and the last time with a request to send a particular document to Spratt. But considering that the whole Prosecution case, as I hold, rests on a theory unsubstantiated or inadequately substantiated by facts, I think that I shall for once get over my reluctances in advancing theories and shall give you one which is more likely and consistent with the records so far produced in this Court than the theory advanced by the Prosecution. The nature of the document as well as the anxiety of the sender as conveyed in the letter lead one to the inference that Mr. Dutt was racking his brains to find out means which would ensure the safe arrival of the document to its destination. In these circumstances it is but natural that he should write to some one whom he knows definitely to be not one of their circle and as such, as he must have rather naively supposed, (not being aware of the conditions in this country) that my letters were exempt from Police curiosity. I am rather confirmed in this belief by P 1610, in which Mr. N. M. Joshi has been used as a cover address for Dange by Mr. V. Chattopadhyaya of the League against Imperialism, who according to the Prosecution holds as important a position in this conspiracy as Mr. C.P. Dutt himself. In this letter we find Mr. Chattopadhyaya explaining to "My dear Dange," that he was sending that particular letter to Mr. Joshi's address because he had learnt from a mutual friend who recently saw him that "our letters do not reach you all."

D/-15-6-31.

With regard to money-orders sent to Spratt care of me, I must say that I never looked at the forms as I had no interest in them. I believe I was asked to sign as a witness to payment and I did so. All along I had an idea that his people at home were sending the money and so I never gave a thought to it. The procedure was this. The peon in charge of the money-order would come and say that there was money-order for Spratt Saheb. I would inform Spratt by note or through phone that I had asked the peon to come on a particular date and at a particular time. As regards telegrams the same applies with this exception that I took charge of the telegrams and sent them unopened to him. I believe on one or two occasions I redirected some telegrams or money-orders to European Asylum Lane.

In connection with P.326 (13) I have to say that this confirms, confirmation were needed, that like an ordinary gentleman with ordinary notions of decency I never thought of opening Spratt's letters or telegrams and considered that an apology was due from me to Spratt on the one occasion when I had opened a telegram meant for him through inadvertence. As for the concluding passage in that note which refers to interceptions of letters and telegrams it is an open secret that ^{however} is engaged in public activities in India, barring perhaps the President the Secretary of the European Association and certainly of the Civil Service Association, gets his mail after it has passed through the hands of the C. I. D. The 'Leader' of Allahabad would bear me out when I say that even personages like Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru and the late Raja of Mahmudabad did not escape the attentions of these gentlemen after they had lost caste, by denouncing the Simon Commission. The grand-mother of Nationalist India—Mrs Beasant—described by the late Mr. Langford James as the "dear old lady" complained more than once in press interviews that her mail was tampered with. In the diary of the late Mr. Montagu we come across the authenticated incident as to how a telegram from the late Mr. Bhupendra Nath Basu, member of the India Council, to Sir Sankaran Nair, member of the Viceroy's Executive Council was withheld and they were put on the suspect list because the telegram referred to the despatch of some sweets from Calcutta, which I may mention is famous for them, on the occasion of a dinner that Sir Sankaran Nair gave to Lord Harding. The ever watchful C. I. D.'s remembered that in the code of the Bengal revolutionaries 'sweets' stood for bombs.

I am sorry I forgot to date this note but I believe the approximate date can be gathered from the fact that I mention there a letter I had addressed to the 'Statesman' which I had tendered as defence exhibit no. 174 (6) dated the 31st May. I am sorry I do not remember the contents of the telegram at all. I do not think it ^{had} anything especial to fix itself on one's memory. At any rate I did not give it a second thought after I had found out that it was not meant for me.

The whole letter is written in a bantering tone and this requires to be specifically mentioned in view of the fate of a letter written in a similar strain by Mr. D.R. Thengdi congratulating, if I remember right, Mr. S. S. Mirajkar on seeking to usher in the Dictatorship of the Proletariat with Marwari money. This was interpreted by both the Prosecution and the learned Magistrate as an expression of Mr. Thengdi's joy at receiving contributions "To be an unimprachable Bolshevik", said Mr. Langford James in his opening address, "it is quite essential that you should

have no sense of humour." I do not know about the unimpeachable Bolsheviks who, if there are any in this dock, will vindicate their position; but I can well see that this applies to Prosecution. I dare not say that this applies to the learned Magistrate as well. So, to guard myself against this lack of sense of humour on the part of the Prosecution I have to point out that the letter was written in a light vein and misunderstanding might be if this fact is kept in mind. In regard to certain references in the letter to Chengail I shall deal with it elsewhere.

I find P 526 (7) described in the index to exhibits as a letter dated 28. 11. 28 from K. L. Ghosh to Spratt announcing Johnstone's arrival and stay with him. I do not know what led to the inference that Johnstone was staying with me. Probably the gentleman responsible for this compilation did not notice the significance of the word 'now'. This, for aught I know, may have influenced the learned Magistrate's findings about my getting on well with Johnstone. However as the prosecution witness from the Continental Hotel deposed that Johnstone had been staying there I trust no further explanation is necessary.

I want to say something further in this connection. This note was not at all intended to be an announcement to Spratt of Johnstone's arrival because Spratt was introduced to Johnstone several days earlier at my place where he happened to drop in accidentally while Johnstone was talking to me. I may also mention here that I introduced Huda to Johnstone on the same day that is 28. 11. 28 at the Howrah station, where he met me in response to a card I dropped to him as I did several others to various Trade Unionists inviting them to come to Bauria and Chengail. This letter also contains an invitation to Mr. Muzaffar Ahmed along with Spratt to visit Bauria. This is one of the several occasions on which I invited him as I invited many other Trade Unionists and sometimes Congressmen to attend and address Bauria meetings. Mr. Muzaffar Ahmed attended none except one in, I believe, January 1929 and it may be on another occasion which I do not recollect.

Then P 27 which is a letter from Spratt dated 29. 11. 28— may be taken as a reply both to P 526 (9) dated 29. 11. 28, and P 526 (7) dated 28. 11. 28. That it is a reply to P 526 (7) would appear from the concluding lines, namely "I received your note yesterday just before 2. 30 when I returned and so I could not possibly come." The first paragraph of P 27 where Spratt says that he could add little to the value of discussion though he would be interested to hear it was in reply to what I said in P 526 (9) about seeing someone for discussion over Chengail

and Bauria affairs. That someone was a leading Congressman and of great influence. Perhaps Spratt's reluctance to participate in the discussion might have been due to this fact. The second paragraph refers to the unfortunate telegram sent to Mr. Saklatwala by Messrs. Radha Raman Mitra and Spratt, which as the learned Magistrate found, considerably upset me. This was Spratt's reply to the substance of the conversation I had with Bankim Baboo over this matter and which I communicated to him in P 526 (9).

My relations with Donald Campbell.

Besides what I stated in the inquiry court as to how I came in contact with Campbell and the character of our relations I have not much to add, except what I think is called for by the observations of the learned Magistrate. Here again that unfortunate "suspicion"; which dogs the Magistrate's footsteps throughout the Committal Order dealing with my case, influenced his reasoning process and he found that Campbell's suggestion to Mr. Spratt that, to quote the Magistrate, "I was a good man to go" to the P. P. T. U. S. Conference at Canton "presupposed" a greater intimacy than was explained by me.

I of course cannot be expected to know what was at the back of Campbell's mind when he suggested my name to Spratt, any more than I can explain what made Spratt write to the friend in England that I was "improving". All that I can say is that the views that I entertain being the result of close study and much thought and my own experience, I have never had any occasion to conceal them. On the other hand I always invited friendly discussion and criticism from those who did not agree with me and were as strongly convinced of the correctness of their views as I was of mine. But during the whole period of 1927 and 1928 I was engaged in the task of organisation, which I considered as the one thing necessary at the present stage of the Trade Union Movement, and so I was interested more in eliciting information from those who had first hand knowledge about the Trade Union organisations abroad; particularly in England and from Johnstone about Trade Union organisations in America than in discussion of abstract principles. Of course the discussion of abstract principles can not wholly be avoided; they are bound to creep up in the course of conversation and discussion would follow.

Campbell was a Trade Unionist and, as I was told by him, belonged to the Miners' Federation. Further he was a Scotchman and like all Scotchman was intensely shrewd and practical. He was far more at home in the practical aspect of the Trade

Union Movement than in the exposition of the theoretical part of his creed. By this I do not mean to suggest that he was not well posted with regard to Communist ideology or the history of the development of Marxism. What I mean to suggest is that having practical experience of the Trade Union Movement in Great Britain and myself being very much interested in the task of organisation our conversation was mostly confined to the actual state of things in England as far as the growth and organisation of British Trade Unions are concerned.

In this connection I may mention one incident which may throw some light on P 24, which has been rather curiously interpreted by the Prosecution, besides throwing some light on the character of our relations. When Campbell briefed me for his case he asked me my terms. I told him that he need not worry because the lawyer in me did not allow me to forget, that I was also a Trade Unionist and that he was a member of the Executive Council of the Trade Union Congress. But he told me with the bluntness which a Scotchman claims to be a peculiar characteristic of his, that in coming to me with the offer of the brief he had only been following the established custom of the British Trade Unions, who in case of need give preference to what they call Labour Lawyers, and then he mentioned some names of "labour lawyers" including that of Sir Henry Slessor the Attorney General in the Labour Government and who was briefed in the case of the twelve Communists. Then he said something about the contradiction involved in the conduct of one who while like himself resolutely opposed to exploitation of all sorts would yet, while he could afford to pay, accept services gratis from another who due to some weakness, he refused to call it by any other name, hesitated to accept remuneration from the new found client because he met him in the course of his public activities. It was in this connection that Campbell said that a Communist, however strongly he might criticise what he would call the ordinary Trade Unionist in season and out of season and however bitter might be the fight he would carry on with the latter, when it comes to the question of rendering assistance in a strike he would unhesitatingly cooperate with the union concerned and place his services at the disposal of the Union to bring the strike to a successful issue, even though the union leading the strike was under reformist control and guidance. What Campbell wanted to convey to me, in short, to overcome my reluctance, he would call it a weakness, in charging fees was that ordinarily the Communist and ordinary Trade Unionist might, should and can not but fight each other from the very nature of things. But if it comes to the question of taking help a Communist would go to a Trade Unionist rather than to any one outside the Labour

Movement. If it is a question of services on which the Trade Unionist depends for a living and if the said Communist can afford to pay for the services the whole matter should be put on a strictly business footing. Similarly a Trade Unionist might count on Communist help on such vital matters as strike where the main thing that mattered immediately was the successful conduct of the strike. I give here as far as I remember, only the bare gist of what he said in the course of a discussion in which I was trying to justify my reluctance to accept fees and he was trying to convince me that it was but a sentimental weakness. In regard to the attitude of a Communist during a strike he repeated what I have just now said more than once in the course of our conversation during the period of his stay in Calcutta and subsequently Mr. Saklatwala said practically the same thing, which was also confirmed by what I read about the subject in the Communist literature - though I can not at present remember the book or the author. If I did not mention this to the Inquiry Magistrate it was because I considered such details as unnecessary and would not have stated in this Court also at such a length had it not been for the way in which the first part of a letter to Mr. N. M. Joshi (P 24) has been interpreted. I mention the matter of the fees to remove any misunderstanding that might be created by Mr. Muzaffar Ahmad's statement that I kindly "accepted the legal brief of D. Campbell" as the Secretary of the B. T. U. F. and charged fees for the same.

Campbell and I parted as best of friends when he was taken in custody to stand his trial at Bombay. It must be mentioned that his case, as far as I had the opportunity of studying it, should not be judged by the severity of the punishment awarded to him. He wanted to come to India and he did come. That the Government normally regard these Passport irregularities as nothing more serious than mere technical offence is proved by their treatment of Inspector Derojinsky who came to India without Passport and as he admitted on cross-examination in this case, had on some previous occasion imposed on the Pass-port officials. I do not remember whether Soviet or Turkish. I think I am entitled to draw the inference that if Campbell's political views were not what they were his case might have been treated at any rate more lightly than it was. He was all along described in the British Press in India as "the notorious Communist." At any rate I did not consider that the offence involved any moral turpitude and as a Trade Unionist of great British experience whose conversation I found very instructive I did not scruple to associate with him as I did in spite of the fact which he knew very well that he and I would never come to see eye to eye on the question of Communism. But with all this personal intimacy

Campbell never took me into his confidence more than was absolutely necessary for him in regard to the case before he knew that the case was to be transferred to Bombay. Even the fact that he was a Communist he did not disclose to me till he engaged me to appear on his behalf. On the occasion he met me before his arrest and on the eve of the meeting of the Executive Council (as referred to by me in my statement before the inquiry Magistrate) he introduced himself as a Miner and Trade Unionist who had come to India to study the movement. I never knew the connections and associates he had in India besides Messrs. Muzaffar Ahmad and Soumyendra Nath Tagore whom he introduced to me as gentlemen who had interested themselves on his behalf and one of them stood surety for him.

In regard to his suggestion that I should go to Canton as conveyed through Spratt's letter P 38 I certainly can not say, as I have already said, what was at the back of his mind.

D/- 16/6/31.

But I did not give the matter much thought because I had no intention of going there. The learned Magistrate would have had no difficulty in coming to a correct finding in this matter, if he had seen his way to make full use of even the materials which the Prosecution had placed before him. The whole proceedings of the Bengal Trade Union Federation was before the Inquiry Court and if he had turned to pages 23-24 he would have found that in a meeting held on the 9th April 1927 a resolution was moved by Mr. K. C. Roy Choudhri that in view of the shortness of the notice and scanty information available about the Canton Conference the Federation did not feel itself competent to pass any opinion one way or the other.

P 34 (3) is a telegram from me to Bakhle the Assistant Secretary of the A. I. T. U. G. sent on the 12th February 1927 under instructions from Campbell given to me when he was being taken in custody to Bombay. As I did not know the address of Mr. G. F. Ginwala, whom Campbell had decided to engage as his solicitor in Bombay because he was a Trade Unionist, I wired to Bakhle c/o the Servants of India Society's home—the Head Office of the A. I. T. U. C. informing that Campbell would arrive next Monday and that arrangements for his bail should be made. P 50 being a letter from Campbell while in Jail asking me if I would act as his lawyer carries its own explanation with it. In regard to P 77 I have nothing to add to what I stated in the lower Court, though the learned Magistrate did not see his way to draw any other inference.

from this exhibit than that I was in touch with Campbell even before I came to have relations with him as between a lawyer and a client. But on the character of those relations he had nothing to say in spite of the clue furnished by P 77. Perhaps if I had not come in touch with Campbell before he entrusted me with his brief, the learned Magistrate would have had no difficulty in finding something sinister and conspiratorial in the fact that Calcutta being so full of lawyers Donald Campbell should have come to me.

I believe I have touched all the exhibits and though I have not specifically referred to a number of them particularly those relating to telegrams and money-orders I believe my explanations have covered them. My explanations are to be taken as supplementary to and sometimes amplifications of the statement I made before the learned Inquiry Magistrate. In case I have omitted to refer to any exhibit which I may subsequently find out has not been covered by my explanations I ask leave to take it up later on before I have finished my statement.

Q. The following papers relate to your connection with the Bengal and Bombay W. P. P.'s and A. I. W. P. P.: P 85, 52, 40, 23, 56, 51, 2510, & 544 (3) & P. W.s. 104, 90, 254 & 36. Have you anything to say about this evidence ?

A. Regarding the pamphlets and leaflets issued by the Workers' and Peasants' Party I do not remember the circumstances under which I came to possess each. There were so many pamphlets and leaflets in my possession issued by the various public bodies received by me either as a Journalist connected with a leading Daily or as the Secretary of B. T. U. F. that it is impossible to remember as to when I received any one of them and through whom. There may be some which I might have received from M. R. Muzaffar Ahmad direct, who perhaps wanted publicity for them, or some might have been sent from the office of the Amrit Bazar Patrika by the sub-editors who were unable to decide whether to publish them, while others might have been sent through post by the Peasants and Workers' Party office to me as Secretary of the Bengal Trade Union Federation. I used to preserve these pamphlets and leaflets as carefully as I studied them because since the time, that is at the beginning of 1927, I came to know of the existence of this Party I had an idea that this Party though essentially a political party had the ambition of being a rival to the Trade Union Congress or at any rate by inviting the affiliation of Trade Unions and also by its attempt to organise unions it would ultimately divide the allegiance of the unions which would be affiliated both to the T. U. C. and the Workers' and Peasants' Party and thus there might be a clash between the two. That this was so would appear from a

signed article I contributed to the Amrit Bazar Patrika in its issue of 31st December 1928 which I intend to tender before the Court. It was written after the Jharia Session of the All India Trade Union Congress and I gave therein my impressions of the Congress.

I regret that my collection of the literature of this Party was not complete, because of the absence of two very important publications of the Party namely "honest Josh's" Presidential Address at the All India Workers and Peasants' Conference at Albert Hall and that historic document known by the inspiring name "Call to action". If I were in as close touch with the Party as the Prosecution gives me credit for I certainly would have been the fortunate possessor of these two documents ^{on} which the Prosecution relies so much for proving complicity in this wonderful conspiracy. That the learned Magistrate also accepted the Prosecution view of the dangerous character of these two pamphlets is proved by the fact that one of the reasons given by the Magistrate for discharging my friend Mr. Chaudhri Dharamvir Singh was that the copy of the "Call to Action" alleged to have been recovered from his possession "looks suspiciously clean and unused." As to the dangerous character of "honest Josh's" historic speech I recall the forensic master-piece of the learned Junior Public Prosecutor who before the Inquiry Court while summing up the individual case of Mr. Gopendra Chakravarty said, "Now I come to the case of Gopendra Chakarvarty. Your Honour, please look at him. He listened attentively to the address delivered by Sohan Singh Josh". In these circumstances I trust that in dealing with the literature issued by the W. P. P. recovered from my possession Your Honour and the five intelligent gentlemen who are here to assess the evidence would attach due significance to the absence of these two pamphlets from my collection. Candour demands that I should confess that I narrowly escaped having in my possession the Presidential Address of Sardar Sahib, but fuller explanation of this will be presently given when I come to deal with the very truthful witness no. 254 that is Rai Sahib Trivedi. I trust Your Honour would not consider me as indulging in trivillaties when I earnestly beg you to remember that if the leaflets and pamphlets issued by the Peasants and Workers Party which were found in my possession happened to have the appearance of being well thumb'd, dirty and much used, it is because these documents were sent to the Press by the Inquiry Magistrate for printing, after they had been tendered by the Prosecution as exhibits and we all know what a document looks like after it has passed through the hands of the printers. I consider this explanation necessary because the logical implications of the learned Magistrate's finding in regard to Mr. Choudhri Dharamvir Singh's copy of the "Call to Action" is that the fact that these leaflets look dirty and

much used is an evidence that the possessor thereof has imbibed the pernicious doctrines preached therein. What I seek to convey to the Court is that I read these pamphlets like any ordinary man but that the amount of interest I took in them should not be judged by their outward appearance. I may also say that being in a responsible position in a public body I considered it necessary to acquaint myself fully with the view-point of any other body with which I thought sooner or later some clash was inevitable. P 85 is a Manifesto to the All India National Congress Gauhati 1926 purporting to have been issued by the Communist Party of India. Shortly after Mr. Muzaffar Ahmad was introduced to me by Donald Campbell under the circumstances I have already mentioned I called on him at his office at 37 Harrison Road where he was living - as a return visit because he had called on me several times since our introduction. I noticed a few copies of this Manifesto lying on a bed and what excited my interest was to learn for the first time that there was a Communist Party of India and that its Manifestoes are published not from India but from England. I do not remember whether I asked Muzaffar Ahmad about this anomaly but I think I did not ask him anything out of politeness, because the question would have suggested that the C.P. of India existed on paper only. I asked him if I might have a copy and he kindly gave me one. I had since then an idea that there were a few Communists in India but no Communist Party as such, because a party which has any other existence than on paper does not run up to London for getting a simple Manifesto printed. I hope I am not more pig-headed than any other but I do not find in spite of all the paraphernalia in this case even now any occasion to revise my idea, though I know that by saying this I run the risk of offending Mr S. V. Ghate, who I understand from the Prosecution evidence happens to be the General Secretary of this rather elusive body.

"There can be no doubt at all that he was on very intimate terms with Spratt in particular, and with most of the Bengal accused"—says the Magistrate in one place and then he refers to "amity between me and Muzaffar which seems rather to have been a personal one". The learned Magistrate quite advisedly said "the Bengal accused" instead of saying "the members of the Workers' and Peasant's Party". But even by carefully choosing his words he could not avoid drawing an inference neither warranted by facts nor even by the records of this case. Far from being "on very intimate terms" with most of the accused I do not know much about most of them and came very seldom if at all in touch with many of them. I did not for example even know the name of Gopal Basak, and when he was brought to jail

I could not recall to my mind ever to have seen him till he said that he had met me at Cawnpore during the Sessions of the A. I. T. U. C. in 1927. I did not know Mr. Ajudhia Prasad by name nor do I remember to have seen him though I can not say this on oath—but what I want to convey is that even if I might have seen him I had never any occasion to talk with him. Mr. Gopendra Chakravarty had talked to me on one occasion which is referred to in one of the exhibits though I might have seen him at Lillooah as I saw many others working for the Union there without knowing their names. Mr. Dharni Goswami came to be in touch with me in connection with the Scavengers' Strike though before that I might have met him once or twice but I can not remember where. I met Shamsul-Huda about half a dozen times or so before my arrest. He was introduced to me at a meeting held at Bauria over which I was presiding, and as I understood he would like to address the meeting I invited him to do so and introduced him to the meeting in the terms in which he was introduced to me, namely as Sayed Shamsul Huda who had been to America for education and was very much interested in Labour. In regard to Mr. Radha Raman Mitra I may say that I first came to know him in about January 1928 or it may be sometime earlier through a common friend Professor Arun Chandra Sen of the Scottish Church College where both Sen and myself studied together for four years and took our B. A. degree in the same year 1912. Mr. Mitra was introduced to me as a graduate who with his friend Mr. Bankim Chandra Mukerji, introduced to me about the same time, as Mr. Sen said, did wonderful organisation work under the Congress at Etawah in U. P. and were respectively the President and Secretary of the Congress organisation there and suffered imprisonment during the Non-Cooperation Movement of 1920-1921. I was further informed that he passed some time at the Sabarmati Ashram. He was at the time and till a considerable time later, as far as I could notice, a Khaddarite and till his arrest was closely connected with the Calcutta Congress Committee. It was also reported to me that he was a Head Master in a primary school in the Calcutta Corporation and he took great pains in organising successfully the Primary Schools Teacher's Association on the T. U. basis. Both Messrs. Mitra and Mukerji were taking considerable interest in the Labour Movement, so Sen informed me, and that they would very much like to help in the task of organisation. I welcomed their offer of help. When I came back from Delhi after the T. U. C. Executive Council meeting in February 1928 with a mandate to organise the Jute Workers Association and a preliminary grant of Rs 250/-, I availed myself of the first opportunity that presented itself at Chengail in getting them elected to important offices of the Union formed there under the

auspices of the Federation. Mr. Mitra was subsequently also elected at my instance to be the Secretary of the Bauria Jute Workers' Union formed under the auspices of the Federation. Neither Mr. Mitra nor Mr. Mukerji, as far as I was aware, had any connection with the Workers' and Peasants' Party nor any of its members. In the course of their activities in the Labour field, in which they became very prominent by virtue of their undoubted ability, they came in touch with Trade Unionists of various schools of thought including some of my fellow accused in the dock.

Shib Nath Banerji was introduced to me as early as 1926 also by Professor Arun-Sen as one who had travelled much in Europe including Soviet Russia and was very much interested in the Cooperative Movement. I remember to have tried to help him in his efforts to start a Cooperative Store in Calcutta which came to nothing.

Next I found him as an associate of Mr. Kalidas Bhattacharji, at the time as far as I remember, the General Secretary of the Bengal Jute Workers' Association. Now this Union and Kankinara Labour Union of which I was a Vice-President used to regard each other in a spirit of rivalry and there was some amount of friction between the two. In the unfortunate dispute in the Bengal Trade Union Federation to which I referred in connection with Donald Campbell, the Bengal Jute Workers' Association led by Mr. Bhattacharji maintained a sort of benevolent neutrality which in practice, as far as we could judge, worked out so that the other side reaped the benefit of the benevolence and we had to be content with all that was left, namely cold neutrality. So far as the relations between the Federation and this association were concerned they were cold, courteous and correct. But subsequently in connection with the organisation of Jute workers' Union under the auspices of the Federation, the negative and I may say passive relations between the two developed into what I used to regard as active hostility on the part of the Bengal Jute Workers' Association supported, as far as I could gather at the time, by the Workers' and Peasants' Party to which this Union got itself affiliated in 1927. I cannot exactly say whether before or after the Bhatpara Conference of the Party. But during this period of active hostility on the part of this Union led by Mr. Bhattacharji Banerjee was not in evidence. It was as far as I could see at the time due to the fact that he was busy at Lillooah, being an important office-bearer of the Union during the period of the look-out—and up till the time of his arrest several months before this case was started.

Now coming to Muzaffar Ahmad, I have already stated the circumstances in which I was introduced to him. I have also stated

that Campbell, canny Scot that he was, did not choose to take me into confidence about anything special in his relations with Muzaffar Ahmad or Tagore which, if the Prosecution can prove what they seek to prove, there must have been. But with the removal of Campbell from Calcutta in custody what made me keep in touch with Mr. Muzaffar Ahmad is that I always used to consider him as a victim of miscarriage of justice, which unfortunately often happens in this country particularly in political cases. His appearance was that of an invalid, and the fact, as he told me, that he contracted in Jail a terrible disease under which he was wasting away, made me feel for him, as it would have made any decent man, not dead to all feelings, feel. His education, as far as university education goes, was not much, but it was evident in the course of our conversation that he was a well-read man and was a mine of information. So I continued to maintain cordial personal relations with him.

But it becomes very difficult to differentiate between persons and the principles they stand for, or the policies they pursue particularly when two persons having the best of personal relations, happen to be actively and I may say prominently connected with movements having for their basis different aims and pursuing policies opposed to each other. Measures cannot be criticised without the agents carrying out those measures coming in for criticism. If I had criticised Mr. Muzaffar Ahmad and his Comrades which I did rather strongly it was not in a reference to what he did to me personally, because, as I have said all along, our personal relations were cordial, but with reference to the conduct and policy they pursued, which I considered extremely harmful to the movement with which I was associated in a responsible capacity, in which I believed, and for the success of which I was and I am ready to suffer as much as they are ready to do for the movement in which they believe. I am sure Mr. Muzaffar was actuated by the same motive in his hostility to me. There is also another aspect of this matter which is likely to cause some confusion because of the limitations imposed on human speech. In political controversies we often find the parties or persons belonging to one side charging the other with personal prejudice, bias or grudge. Even there it should not be taken literally in the sense of private grudge without due regard to all the circumstances or due reference to the context. Now, I had come to realise since after I had made some progress in the organisation of the Jute Workers' Union at Chengail and Bauria that I was being regarded with particular hostility by Mr. Kalidas Bhattacharji with the support or connivance of Mr. Muzaffar Ahmad. But even here it must be taken that I was so regarded as I thought I was because, as the Secretary of the Bengal Trade Union Federation, I was bent upon organizing Unions which

if they really develop into strong Unions would surely hamper those in charge of the policy of the B. J. W. A. in the pursuit of their particular policy even if these Unions were, as I had suggested more than once to Mr. Bhattacharjia and his friends, either federated or formed into single Union with Head Office in Calcutta and branches at several centres. Now this may be regarded as a personal hostility, but only in the sense that though they had no criticism to offer to my conduct of the strike, to my scheme of Federation or fusion, yet they would oppose me at every step, hamper me in my task and carry on propaganda against me—all of which might bring about the collapse of the strike—simply because my success would mean the success of the Bengal Trade Union Federation, which they wanted to prevent at all costs. In other words they recognised that in doing what I was doing I was carrying out the policy of the Bengal Trade Union Federation in accordance with the principles for which the Federation stood and which it was their duty to oppose. Here though the opposition was directed at me personally, but it was done so because I was representing a particular policy. The learned Magistrate did not take into account this aspect of the case, though a study of the records as had been presented by the Prosecution to him at that stage would have given him enough materials for coming to a correct finding.

D. 17/6/31.

The nature of the hostility as I have tried to explain would appear from P. 593 T, being an editorial note published in the Ganawani of 26th July 1928, that is within a fortnight of the commencement of the deadlock at Bauria. Here there is nothing which indicates personal, in the sense of private, grudge. Ganawani was the declared organ of the Workers' and Peasants' Party, and the Bengal Jute Workers' Association was affiliated to the Workers' and Peasants' Party. It is quite natural to assume therefore that the Workers' and Peasants' Party was supporting the attitude taken up by the Bengal Jute Workers' Association. The attitude taken up by the Bengal Jute Workers' Association under the leadership of Mr. Kali Das Bhattacharji was summed up by me in P. 24 which is a letter dated the 17th December 1928 addressed by me to Mr. N. M. Joshi, of which one part was misinterpreted by the Prosecution while the rest was completely ignored. This is what I said about the difference between myself and Kali Das: "his presumption is that because his Union is called the Bengal Jute Workers' Association therefore all the Unions that may be formed by the Workers in the Industry should be as its branches. I pointed out to Kali Das that let the organisation of the Unions go on and then it would be time for the Jute Unions to

consolidate themselves on the basis of Federation or into one Union with branches spreading out in the whole Jute area."

In the editorial note in the Ganavani referred to just now I have been criticised for my failure to carry out a resolution passed by the A.I.T.U.C. at Delhi discouraging the formation of small overlapping unions in the same Industry. The full text of the resolution referred to may be found in D 240 which is a circular letter dated 15th May 1927 addressed by Mr. N.M. Joshi to the members of the Executive Council, the Secretaries of the affiliated unions and the Secretaries of the Provincial Committees as well as Provincial organisers and this circular dealt with the very resolution referred to in the editorial note. After regretting that the Congress while passing the resolution omitted to name the Committee or to lay down the method by which the committee should be appointed to formulate detailed plans whereby the existing local and sectional unions should be amalgamated into National Industrial organisations, the circular concludes thus:—"It may be suggested that as a beginning effort should be made to unite or at least to federate rival unions existing in one industry or undertaking in the same town or city, and it may also be suggested that the Provincial Committees are specially fitted to undertake this work."

In about the middle of 1927 - this circular was dated 15th May 1927—I tried my best to put an end to the rivalry of the Kankinara Labour Union and Bengal Jute Workers' Association. If ever there was over-lapping it was here - the offices of the two Unions were within about three miles of each other - they used to operate practically in the same area. I persuaded the Kankinara Labour Union to submit to arbitration by threatening it that I should resign from the Vice Presidentship. I suggested the name of an impartial gentleman named Sriyut Upendra Nath Banerji, who commands universal esteem in Bengal.

The Kankinarah Labour Union agreed to be bound by his decision whatever that decision might be, but Mr. Kalidas Bhattacharji, though he did not point blank refuse to accept arbitration, managed to avoid it or evade it till I gave up the attempt in despair. The position was therefore that while the Jute Industry employed about 3,60,000 workers there were two Unions claiming between them not more than three thousand members, as could be judged from the affiliation fee each paid to the A.I.T.U.C.

The Bengal Jute Workers' Association was four or five years old. It secured financial help from Dundee Jute Workers' Union and also secured a grant from the A.I.T.U.C. in 1926 at a

meeting of its Executive in Bombay in April, when I supported most strongly Mr. Bhattacharji's application for help in spite of his tacit support to the other Party in the Federation dispute. I supported Mr. Bhattacharji's application to his own surprise, because I have always held and consistently acted on the principle that the leaders' quarrels or differences of opinions should never be allowed to interfere with mutual cooperation in the broader interests of the working class, whether in the matter of organisation or in the matter of bringing a strike to a successful issue. But when I found that in spite of the help he received the organisation work was not proceeding satisfactorily, that the vast bulk of the workers remained un-organised, that Mr. Bhattacharji affiliated the Union to the Workers' and Peasants' Party, while keeping the Union as much aloof from the Provincial Committee of the A.I.T.U.C. as was possible for a Union affiliated to the Congress, I considered it absurd for the Provincial Committee to wait for the pleasure of this Jute Union to organise the workers in that particular industry. I submitted a report to the Executive Council of the A.I.T.U.C. which held its meeting at Delhi in February 1928 drawing pointed attention to the possibilities in the Jute area. D 218 is a part of the draft copy of a report I submitted to Mr. N. M. Joshi, the General Secretary on the eve of the meeting of the Executive Council. (A look at the report would make it clear that certain pages were missing from it.)

The Champdany Labour League referred to in this report was a union, which I at first thought of re-organising but subsequently had to give up the idea for the time being, firstly, because it was not far away enough from the two existing Unions to avoid friction which I wanted to avoid at all costs and secondly because chance gave me an opening at Chengail which, besides being far away from the two rival Unions, offered opportunities for organising a large number of workers within a comparatively compact area covered by Chengail, Chakkasia and Bauria, with the further prospect of enabling the Federation to operate on certain other mills close by on the opposite side of the Ganges. These considerations diverted my attention and subsequently engrossed my time and energy to such an extent as to make it impossible for me to take up the re-organisation of Champdany Labour League. My idea was to build up a big and strong Union with membership of at least 30 to 40 thousand. Such a Union, when the question of fusion or Federation with the existing Unions in the Industry should come, would naturally have a large voice in the matter of that re-constitution and would be able to bring effective pressure on smaller Unions in the same industry frittering away their energy in petty squabbles, and put an end to their rivalry.

The B.T.U.F would also be considerably strengthened and so consequently would be the A.I.T.U.C because the Central body or the Federated body draws its nourishment from its constituents or component parts. My end was to make the Bengal Trade Union Federation and consequently the A.I.T.U.C a powerful body, and to do this I had to set about organising strong Unions — the best and most effective way to strengthen the Trade Union Movement. The Jute Industry for a first beginning offered, according to me the best field and I commenced operations there to be extended gradually as I said in my report, that is D 218 to other industries as well.

But the attitude of the Bengal Jute workers' Association was distinctly hostile. The association in its own time and at its own pleasure wanted to take up the organisation work. No one else, not even the Federation under the direct authority from the T. U. C. should undertake this work. The Jute workers should wait till the Association chooses to extend its sphere of operations to cover the entire area. It reminds one, if I may be pardoned in saying so, of the White Australian Policy which would leave the vast stretches of land in Australia unpeopled and undeveloped for centuries rather than allow the yellow skinned people from overcrowded Japan and China to settle there. It may be, but I am not sure, that Mr. Kalidas Bhattacharji and his Comrades thought it better for the workers to wait indefinitely than be organised under yellow leadership. At any rate, this is an impression one gets from an article in the Inprecorr of 3rd January 1929 which the Prosecution failed to put in before the Inquiry Magistrate, perhaps in a fit of absent-mindedness. The article is entitled "The Bauria Jute Mill Lock-out in India" by M. Ali. If what the prosecution has said or suggested about Mohammad Ali alias Sepassi is true, it would not be far fetched if I submit that this M. Ali is Mohammad Ali alias Sepassi. But it matters very little for my purpose whether the writer is Mohammad Ali or the man in the moon, because what I am concerned to show is that the feelings of hostility manifested by the leaders of the B. J. W. A. with the official support of the Workers' & Peasants' Party, were reflected in the Inprecorr, which the Prosecution contends is the official organ of the Communist International. The writer referred to the Reformist leaders, M. K. Bose and my humble self, and took care to give my full designation, namely Secretary of Bengal Trade Union Federation and President of Bauria Jute Workers' Union. Then the writer quotes an article which is evidently a report in a Calcutta newspaper: and he refers to a visit of mine to Chengail and Bauria " to see how order and former peace could be re-established and whether a healthy atmosphere of confidence is possible between the employers

and workers." This and other facts, as the writer finds stated in the newspaper from which he quotes, give him an occasion for the usual fulmination against "the treacherous role played by Reformist Trade Union Leaders" which role the writer sums up as follows: "to discourage and sabotage strikes in the beginning in case the workers refuse to listen to their advice and go on strike and show a fighting spirit, to try to take the leadership in their hands in order finally to betray the strikes by making an 'Hon'ble settlement'." Then the writer goes on to say "The Bauria Union which works under the instructions of the re-actionary Federation led by Gosh is playing the same role from the beginning. The Bengal Jute Workers' Association, now an old organisation now under the leadership of the W.P.P. (Workers' & Peasants' Party) is at war with the Federation and so far has not had the opportunity of coming openly out in the struggle at Bauria beyond the fact that certain speakers from the W. P. P. and the Association have spoken at the meetings of the strikers.

Then the writer, just to prove how damnable the Reformists are, resorts to half-truths and misrepresentations. Instead of giving all the facts in regard to a meeting held at Bauria which was attended by one Mr. Cameron with an offer for settlement, the writer quotes one or two short extracts from a newspaper which I shall presently show is The "Forward" of Calcutta, and then gives an extremely garbled account of what took place in the meeting. Fortunately I found amongst the articles recovered from my search a cutting from the 'Forward' containing a report of the identical meeting which I have put in as D 179 (1), and a look both at D 179 (2) and the article in the Inprescorr would enable Your Honour to see that some of the extracts in the letter are verbatim quotations from the former.

In this connection I must say a word or two in regard to the finding of the learned Magistrate on page 272 where he observes that the Bauria Union was affiliated to B. T. U. F. in opposition to the wishes of W. P. P. (P. 2419). Now, sir, P 2419 happens to be a photo of a letter dated 22. 10. 28 purporting to be from Spratt to 'Dear Robin.' I have very carefully gone through this exhibit which gives an account of the activities of the Workers' & Peasants' Party in connection with strikes. I say there nothing which supports the finding of the Magistrate. There was never any question of considering the wishes of the W. P. P. in regard to the affiliation of Bauria Jute Workers' Union—nor at the time there could be any question of its affiliation at all to the Federation because the Union itself was formed under the auspices of the Federation which was conducting the strike that originated in the

lock-out. The Union, according to Congress constitution could not be affiliated to the A. I. T. U. C. unless it had completed one year of its existence and the affiliation would have to be through the Federation, that is, the Provincial Committee. As soon as it would be affiliated it would be accorded full autonomy in accordance with the constitution of both the A. I. T. U. C. and its Provincial Committee.

But while P. 2419P does not support the finding of the learned Magistrate, it supports me in the account it gives of the relation between the Bengal Trade Union Federation and the Workers' & Peasants' Party and the attitude of the Bengal Jute Workers Association and the Workers' and Peasants' Party towards the Bauria Jute Workers' Union. I quote the relevant extract: "in connection with the Bauria Jute Mill strike which is still going on, I believe we have pursued a thoroughly wrong policy. The situation is that the oldest Jute Union, the Jute Workers' Association, is led by us, but there recently have been established at Chengail and Bauria separate Unions under the rather reactionary leadership of the Bengal Trade Union Federation. When the lock-out took place at Bauria the Association instead of helping and getting support simply stood aloof and did nothing. I have been to Bauria a number of times and have tried, since I realised what was happening, to persuade the Association to alter its policy but without success. The Federation is naturally making much capital out of it. The feud has as usual assumed an intensely personal form and to act correctly in such circumstances is very difficult."

In view of what I said yesterday about the difficulty of condemning measures and at the same time sparing those who are responsible for those measures and are parties to disputes arising out of differences of views and outlook developing into an attack on persons differing from each other and also in view of the explanation given by Spratt in this Court of the quarrel between me and those of "his political views" being due to Trade Union rivalry, it is not difficult to see that the learned Magistrate erred in holding that my enmity with Muzaffar Ahmad was personal in the sense that we had private grudge against each other.

There is another point in this connection which should be noted. The writer in the Inprecorr suggests that the members of the Workers' and Peasants' Party so far had not had the opportunity of coming openly out in the struggle because of the "cussedness" of the Bauria Union which under the reactionary Federation was playing the treacherous role of the reformists, so kindly assigned by the Communists to the reformists all over the world. But P 2419 P seems to be more concerned with truth than with proving the wicked character of the reformists and writes that the B. J. W. A.

instead of helping and getting support simply stood aloof, and thereby gave the rather reactionary leadership of the B. T. U. F. a handle for criticism or to quote the exact words "making much capital out of it." It should be noted here that I, far from refusing the help from any member of the Workers' and Peasants' Party because of my difference of political views with them, invited such help, but the help was not coming, instead of it opposition and criticism were my lot, and when I wrote P 24 to Mr. Joshi I was referring to this aspect of the conduct of certain members of the Workers' and Peasants' Party whom I considered to be Communists in their beliefs and sympathies. Here and there, there are certain other exhibits put in by the Prosecution or defence which can be cited in support of my explanation that there are political differences which are responsible for the clash between me and Mr. Muzaffar Ahmad and his comrades and that there was nothing personal in it. I have also, while disputing the finding of the learned Magistrate, shown the character of the relations between the Bengal Trade Union Federation as represented by me and the Workers' and Peasants' Party and the B. J. W. A. as represented respectively by Mr. Muzaffar Ahmad and Mr. Kali Das Bhattacharji.

But I consider that my explanation would not be complete unless in this connection I dispose of certain matters referred to by the learned Magistrate who, like the Prosecution, seem to have a very confused notion as to my exact relations with the Workers' and Peasants' Party. To a certain extent the Prosecution is responsible, as I have pointed out on several occasions in the course of my statement, for misleading the learned Magistrate by the suppression of material evidence which might have helped him to come to a correct finding. To a certain extent, if I may say so, the learned Magistrate himself is responsible because, as I find the reference that he himself gives as the basis of his finding does not sometimes bear him out. I have already given one instance by a reference to P 2419, I intend to give here another. On page 279 the learned Magistrate, while admitting that my "relations with Bengal Party (W. P. P.) were poor" (in flat contradiction to what he said on page 276 where he has no doubt at all that I was "on very intimate terms with most of the Bengal accused", continues "Muzaffar Ahmad had attacked him in the Ganavani for creating separate Unions at Bauria and Chengail (P 593) (page 279 last para) and it was looked on as a retrograde step that they should be affiliated to the B. T. U. F. a "rather reactionary" body. (P. 2419). In spite of this Spratt and other members of the Party helped him to conduct the Strikes and even accepted office in the Union (P. W. 69).⁹ I have already

pointed out how in view of the relations between Chengail and Bauria Unions with the Federations there can be no question of affiliation and that there was no mention about it in (P 2419 P). As regards his reference to P. W. 69 I may say that there is nothing in his statement to support the view that any of the members of the Workers' and Peasants' Party took office at Chengail Jute Workers' Union or even at Bauria.

Dated 18. 6. 31.

I have given a somewhat detailed account of my relations with the Bengal accused, the circumstances in which I came to be acquainted with those whom I knew and the character of our relations. I have also given an account of the character of my connection with the Bengal Jute Workers' Association and with the Bengal Peasants' and Workers' Party with particular reference to Bauria Dead-lock. In connection with Ryan I have also explained that the presence of Messrs. Dharni Goswami and Muzaffar Ahmad at a Federation meeting was due to the fact that they were office-bearers of a Union, namely the Scavengers, which was not yet affiliated to the A. I. T. U. C. or B. T. U. F because it did not as yet, as required by the Congress constitution, complete one year's existence.

There were certain other occasions on which either Dharni Goswami or Mr. Muzaffar Ahmad or both figure in connection with Federation meetings, for example both of them were elected on a Committee formed by the Federation to take all measures for the success of the May Day celebration which all affiliated Unions and Provincial Committees were asked to organise by circular letter issued by Mr. N. M. Joshi, General Secretary to the A. I. T. U. C. I do not think it is necessary to reply to the suggestion made by the Prosecution that whatever might have been the origin of May Day it is now essentially an occasion for Communist Demonstration. D. 254 will show that the International Federation of Trade Unions at Amsterdam has not yet accepted the Prosecution view about May Day. In this connection I noticed that P. W. 53 who deposed to this celebration of May Day did not give even the gist of what I said at the meeting held on that occasion. D. 162 will show, as page 37 of P 26 shows, that the whole thing was duly organised by the Federation. I notice in this connection that this particular exhibit has been so printed as to give the idea that only six persons, namely Muzaffar Ahmad, Aftab Ali, Dharni Goswami, Radha Raman Mitra, Bankim Mukherjee and myself were the members of the Committee. As a matter of fact there were several others who represented Unions affiliated or not yet affiliated including

Mr. Mrinal Kanti Bose, the President of the Federation.

There was, as far as I remember, only one occasion when the Bengal Trade Union Federation invited the representatives of the workers ^{and peasant party} as such. That was in connection with a meeting it held to devise ways and means for an organised campaign against the Trade Disputes Bill and the Public Safety Bill. It was a letter dated 15. 8. 28 addressed by me to the General Secretary and to the Labour Secretary of the Workers' and Peasants' Party of Bengal who were, if I remember aright, respectively Mr. Muzaffar Ahmad and Mr. Dharni Goswami. This letter was in reply to a letter over their joint signatures addressed to me suggesting that the Federation should take steps and that the Workers' and Peasants' Party was prepared to cooperate with it in the steps that it might take for an organised campaign against these Bills.

A meeting of the Federation was held on the 21st August and dealt with this letter as would appear from its proceedings (P 26), page 41. A resolution was moved by Mr. K. C. Roy Choudhry and seconded by Mr. Daud in regard to this letter and steps that the Federation should take in the matter. This resolution also decided to convene a conference of the representatives of Unions, affiliated and non-affiliated, as also of the workers to be held on the 2nd of September 1928. The Conference was duly held on that date under the auspices of the Federation at Albert Hall to which besides the Union representatives were also invited the representatives of the Bengal provincial Congress Committee and of the Workers' and Peasants' Party. In P. 544 (2) which was dropped by the prosecution in this Court but retained by me as a Defence Exhibit, a rough idea of what took place in the Conference may be obtained. As rough notes for a report to be drawn up later on, this document, which was perhaps prepared by Spratt, may be relied upon as substantially accurate barring one or two mistakes due to the fact that the proceedings were mostly conducted in vernacular which Spratt could not pick up as yet; for example in the concluding portions of the note under the head Discussion we find 'Godbole (Illegible)..... self, Kishori, Mahbub, Daud and many others attacked Congress and cooperation of B.P.C.C.' and then we find "Kishori repudiates Mahbub." What happened was that a resolution drafted by me was moved by Mr. Radha Raman Mitra and seconded by Mr. Abdul Haq, General Secretary of the Indian Bengal Mariners' Union to the effect that a series of meetings should be organised under the joint auspices of the Bengal Trade Union Federation and the Bengal Provincial Committee of

the Indian National Congress, with a view to explain to the public in general and the workers in particular the pernicious and reactionary character of the two Bills, that is the Trade Dispute Bill and the Public Safety Bill, and urge upon the members of the legislative Assembly to throw them out. There were certain other clauses in the resolution, but I am referring only to the relevant portion — the points in the resolution may be found in the concluding portion of P. 544 (2). Now the representatives of the Workers' and Peasants' Party including Spratt opposed Congress cooperation, and in this they were supported by some of the leading Trade Unionists like Messrs. Mahbulul Haq (whose name has come into the records as President of the Chengal Jute Workers' Union) and Daud who presided over the Jheria session of the A.I.T.U.C. It was through mistake that Spratt must have included me in the list of those who, as he describes, attacked Congress and opposed inviting the cooperation of B.P.C.C. The mistake may be due to the fact that my first speech was in Bengali. As a matter of fact, when I found that the resolution was about to be defeated because most of the Union representatives were likely to be influenced by Messrs. Mahbulul Haq and Daud I took permission of the chair to remove certain mis-conceptions which might arise in consequence of the speeches made against Congress cooperation particularly by Mr. Mahbulul Haq, who seemed to think that by acting in cooperation with the Congress we ran the risk of losing our Independence and of being relegated, to the position of a subordinate body. The second speech I delivered in English because I had also to meet some of the objections to the cooperation as urged by Spratt. However, I persuaded the Conference by a large majority to pass the resolution, of which I have already given the substance as far as it is relevant to the present case.

The representatives of the Worker's & Peasants' Party naturally did not like the resolution, far less did they like the idea of cooperation with the Provincial Committee of the National Congress. In "Ganavani" dated the 6th September 1928 which has been marked P 593 there is on page 3 an extract marked with blue pencil as D 188, a translation of which would be found on page 21 of the printed deposition of P. W. 92. I am not so much concerned with the criticism itself, which can be easily met, as to show the sort of views entertained by the Party on the Conference as expressed through its organ. There is another attack on me in the same issue in connection with another matter, namely the Simon Commission. I am not concerned with showing that this criticism was unjust, that as Secretary of the Federation I took steps in the matter but in a way which and

at a time when the Federation considered suitable. What I am concerned with showing here was how the Workers' & Peasants' Party missed no opportunity in criticising the Federation and its unfortunate Secretary. In accordance with the resolution of the Conference a number of public meetings was held, the first of which was held at Albert Hall under the Presidency of, if I remember aright, Mr. J. M. Sen Gupta. But it was hard to please the Workers' and Peasants' Party and its organ, the Ganavani, which in its issue of 13-9-28 came out with some left-handed compliments in an editorial note marked D 189, a translation of which is to be found on page 23 of the deposition of P. W. 92. As a programme of a series of meetings with date and place was published in most of the papers, to be held under the joint auspices of the B. P. C. C. and B. T. U. F. in pursuance of the resolution passed at the Conference, the members of the Party had to admit that something was done. But it was not clear to the "Ganavani" as to how far our activities would extend. It then goes into psychological problems: "considering the mentality with which this party has begun work it does not at all seem likely that they will at all go farther than making speeches in a number of protest meetings. If the Congress and the Federation hope by this sort of speech-making to frighten the Government of India and achieve their purpose we are bound to acclaim their self-confidence."

I need not meet this criticism also because, easy though it is to meet, this is not a place for doing it. But while not claiming to know the "mentality" of the Workers' and Peasants' Party I find that their activities did not extend beyond a leaflet or two in English, which is of course the language with which to approach the Indian workers, and a few articles in "Ganavani" the style of which, however it might do credit to the literary attainments of its conductors, was certainly beyond the comprehension of the workers.

Now I come to deal with P. W. 90 and P. W. 254 who deposed respectively that I took part in a demonstration organised by the All India Workers' and Peasants' Party on the 23rd December and that I attended the Conference of the All India Conference of the party held at Albert Hall on the 21st, 22nd and 23rd December 1928.

"As regards his attendance at the All India Workers' and Peasants' Party Conference", observes the learned Magistrate, "and his participation in the procession I cannot regard it as entirely unnatural for one who had an official position in the Trade Union Movement and had personal friends among the leaders of the Party. I do not think that these things taken by themselves

show such a close connection with the W. P. P. that he must necessarily be assumed to have accepted their aims," and then he goes on to give his views as to when strikes and Labour meetings are legitimate and when illegitimate. It all depends on the purposes in view. With regard to his views on strikes and Labour meetings I shall have an occasion to deal with them later on. Here I am concerned with his finding regarding my alleged attendance in the Conference and participation in the demonstration organised by it. But here also I need not discuss how far a person officially connected with a public body can take part in the meetings and demonstrations of another body with which he does not see eye to eye, as a matter of fact with which he was fighting in his official capacity. The question does not arise because I did not participate in the demonstrations at all—I was not even aware that such a demonstration was organised.

As regards my attending the Conference if going there for a few minutes once in the course of three days and that at its fag and for some other purpose which had nothing to do with the Conference was attendance, I must admit that I did attend the Conference. The facts briefly stated are these. On the last day of the Executive Council meeting of the A. I. T. U. C. at Jharia I appealed to the representatives of the Trade Unions for help to the Bauria workers with the result that a few hundred rupees were promised on the spot by the representatives of the Unions like the Jamshedpur Labour Union, Jharia Colliery Employees Union, G. I. P. Ry. Union, Bombay Textile Union of which R. R. Bakhle was the General Secretary, B. N. R. Indian Labour Union etc. Diwan Chaman Lal promised on behalf of the Punjab Workers a handsome donation and B. F. Bradley promised on behalf of Girni Kamgar Union (not yet affiliated to the Congress) a sum of Rs. 100/- as he said "on his own responsibility" which he hoped would be increased. Shortly after when I met Bradley and some other Bombay Trade Unionists in Calcutta at European Asylum Lane where I went to see them as soon as I learnt of their arrival in Calcutta, I told him that I wanted to take them for a visit to Bauria. I wanted to let them see for themselves the condition of things prevailing at Bauria so that they might secure some help from the Bombay workers. Bradley made an appointment for himself and his friends for the 23rd December and asked me to pick them up from Albert Hall in the afternoon as they would be there at the time in connection with the Conference. I went there and met Abdul Halim at the door, who took me into the Hall where the Conference was to be held and shoved into my hand a number of leaflets and pamphlets and relating to the Conference and regretted he could not give a me copy of the Presidential Address as the printed copies were either exhausted or it was not yet printed—I do not remember what. However

I had no time to do anything more than exchange a few words with some whom I knew. B. F. Bradley who came to me from the dais or platform and expressed his inability to come in view of the state of things which I found very much disturbed. As a matter of fact I found the Conference rather uproarious and Sardar Sahib was frantically trying to restore order. It was I was told because of some highly controversial point. However Bradley took me out of the Hall with two or three gentlemen including Mr. Kulkarni of the G. I. P. Railway Union with whom I was introduced at Jharia. The other gentlemen were also the office-bearers of the same Union, who I understood would accompany me. As I had very little time to spare I hurried them on to a taxi which was unfortunately held up near the Howrah Bridge, which as those who have gone to Calcutta know very well is very much congested with traffic. At Howrah Station two or three other Trade Unionists including Mr. Kalappa of the B.N.R., who in 1929 attended Geneva as advisor and at the British Trade Union Congress as the fraternal delegate from A. I. T. U. C., were to wait for me by appointment as they too were invited by me to go to Bauria. However I found Mr. Kalappa alone, but we missed the train and as there was no convenient down train available to take us back to Howrah the same night if we had started by the next train, so we had to come back disappointed. I took them in a taxi and left them at the junction of Harrison Road and College Square very close to Albert Hall from where I took them. I do not remember where Kalappa got down. I then went away home very much disappointed as the gentlemen whom I had taken with me on a fruitless errand, were going away the same night or the next day and so could not go to Bauria. This is the story of my attendance at the Conference.

In connection with the deposition of P. W. 254 Rai Bahadur M.V. Trivedi Superintendent of Police, I beg to point out that P.W. 36 S.I. G.B. Roy of the Calcutta Special Branch C.I.D, who also deposed to this Conference did not mention my name at all. If I remember aright the R. B. also could not identify me in the Inquiry Court though he read out from a list certain names which included my name. Now Sub Inspector G. B. Roy who certainly had seen me on many occasions and in many meetings in the course of his official duties including the meeting of the 8th May 1928 to which he deposed in this Court, must have mentioned my name if he had happened to see me. This officer did not mention my name amongst those present. It is extremely unlikely that he should have omitted to mention me if I were there as one, "who" (to quote the junior Public Prosecutor) "took an interest in the proceedings". P.W. 254 states, "the whole of my evidence has been given from memory apart from the list of persons present at the All India Workers' and

Peasants' Conference given by me. The typed list from which I refresh my memory was prepared by me soon after the meeting was over from memory and also from notes taken by me. After preparing my report I destroyed my notes. Those rough notes contained other facts relating to the proceedings of the Conference, that is connected with the Conference. The list was submitted along with my report. I do not know what has become of my report. Presumably it is in the office..... there were also members of the Bengal police present whose names I do not know. I think there were also reporters present..... I have not seen any of the persons in this list since I left Calcutta after that Conference.....I had full opportunity to see the accused when I was giving evidence in the lower Court in order to identify them. In the Lower Court I identified Gauri Shankar, Ghosh and Shamsul Huda. I heard my evidence read out there and signed it, finding it to be correct..... I no doubt in the Lower Court in giving the names of persons present in the Jharia Congress gave one name as Bose or Ghose. I was referring to accused Kishori Lal Ghosh." I have quoted rather at length from the deposition of this witness to show how much reliance is to be placed on him. He did not identify me at all in the Lower Court, when the time that had elapsed between his seeing me last and when he came to depose in the Lower Court was shorter than when he came last before this court, and yet his memory seems to have improved with the lapse of time ! Moreover he was not at all sure as to whether a Bose or a Ghose was present at Jharia. But in this Court he had no doubt that by Bose or Ghose he referred to me. Further though he admits that he did not see any of the persons in the list since he left Calcutta after the Conference yet his memory was so sharp that he could identify a man after seeing him once or twice ! Then with regard to that report of his, nobody knows, least of all he, as to what became of it, though the list which he stated he had submitted along with his report was available to him for refreshing his memory. It is also a well-known fact that while Kasle had never gone to Calcutta he was made to attend the Conference in Calcutta by this witness. Similar was the case with Muzaffar Ahmad who was made to attend Jharia Session of the A. I. T. U. C. though as far as we know he did not attend it. This witness farther is so resourceful that he could get an entrance into the Executive Council meeting of A. I. T. U. C. which is not open to any one other than members. If the report with which the list was annexed was as he presumes in the office, then it seems to be rather unusual that instead of relying on the report for refreshing his memory he would give evidence without its aid while being furnished only with the list of the names of those who attended the Conference.

As regards P. W. 90 A. S. I. Abdul Rashid Khan all that I can say that it is not difficult for people of his position to know me because it was their job to do so and to put, or to mention my name in any connection that he wants was not a difficult job particularly as he also was speaking from memory and had not even a list as the R. B. Trivedi had. The learned junior Public Prosecutor wanted to make a point against me because I did not give any explanation about this in the Lower Court. "If he was not interested in the movement," he contended, "why did he go there?" As a matter of fact I confined myself in the Lower Court only to answering the question put by the Magistrate and volunteered only a few observations regarding the character of my Trade Union activities which I considered to be necessary in view of the suggestion of the Prosecution that the conspiracy was furthered or advanced by participation in the Trade Union Movement. Moreover the nature of the evidence tendered in the Lower Court in this matter was such as to throw considerable doubt as to its reliability. At any rate that is what I thought and did not consider that it was important enough to call for any voluntary statement on my part. Mr. Khairat Nabi while your Honour was giving me a list of the exhibits to be explained drew your attention that there were two copies of P. 51 and P 56 each, which happened respectively to be the "Political" and Trade Union Resolutions of the Conference. All that I can say with regard to these is that Mr. Abdul Halim was responsible for this lavish distribution and I did not notice at the time at all what those leaflets were and how many of them were given to me.

I may here say that I do not consider that there is anything criminal in attending a meeting or a Conference even though organised by a party with which one is not in agreement nor do I think that attendance at such a meeting necessarily implies approval or acceptance of the views of the organisers or of what transpires in the meeting because if this were so attendance in most political meetings would be extremely thin. I also do not think that any apology or explanation is needed if anyone attends such a meeting. As a matter of fact though I did not attend the Bhatpara Session of the Bengal Peasants' and Workers' Party Conference in 1927, Mr. Mrinal Kanti Bose and myself as President and Secretary respectively of the B. T. U. F. sent in a telegram wishing success to the Conference, which no more implies approval of its views than the message of good-will sent by Messrs Harry Pollitt and William Paul to the All India Press Employees' Conference implied that they approved of its views. I say this also to bring out that in 1927 the Peasants' and Workers' Party had very little activity to its credit which could bring about a clash with the Federation; whereas in 1928 particularly towards

the end the relations between the party and the Federation in connection with Bauria and other matters, as I have already shown by extracts from "Ganavani", were extremely strained. It is rather unusual for the Secretary of a public body to attend meetings and Conference of another body in these circumstances.

P 544 (3) is a list of Trade Unions in Bengal. There are I find the names of forty-four Unions. As the Secretary of the Bengal Trade Union Federation it was of course one of my duties to keep in touch with the Unions affiliated or even those which are not yet affiliated. But I am sorry to say that except about 25 or 26 Unions I never heard the names of others nor knew that even an attempt to organise the workers in these industries was going to be made by anyone! Amongst the Unions which have been alleged here to be affiliated with W. P. P. I know only three, namely Bengal Scavengers' Union, Bengal Textile Workers' Union, Bengal Paper Mill Workers' Union and heard about one more namely the Bengal Transport Workers' Union incidentally in the course of a conversation with Mr. Shamsul Huda, who told me that he was organising the Transport Workers' Union. P 2510 is in my hand-writing and it is a translation of a Bengali printed leaflet or manuscript handed over to me by Mr. Muzaffar Ahmad with a request to me to render it into English, it may be some time in the middle of 1927, though I am not positive. It was, I understood from him, the programme of the Peasants' and Workers' Party of Bengal and an English translation of it was urgently required for circulation. It is a translation of P 1414 B. With regard to the programme I shall have to say something later on.

Q. The following evidence relates to the part taken by you in Trade Unions and Strikes; P.W.'s 47, 94 and 36, P 1893 (1), 1893 (3), 2172, 2264, 2265, P. W's 98, 27, 37, P 2222, 2223, 2224, 2044, 526 (15), 130, 696, 25, 83, 526 (7), 694, 593 Ganavani of 26. 7. 28, 24, 116, 526 (9), 27, 526 (13), 107, 86, 70, 41, 43, 45, 119, 121, 416 (8) and 955. Have you anything to say about this evidence? •

A. "The Secretary of the Bengal Trade Union Federation", observes the learned Magistrate, "might find nothing strange in attending such strikes and meetings (that is Chengail, Bauria and Lillopah strikes) and of course it is not suggested that the accused were the only speakers or persons present. In particular he might legitimately go to the meetings in connection with the Chengail and the Bauria strikes, because in both cases he was an office-bearer of the Unions concerned and the Unions were founded under a direct mandate from the Congress (P 24) and the Bauria Union was affiliated to the B. T. U. F. in opposition to the wishes of the

W. P. P. (P. 2419). It must, however, be brought out that he did not attend any of the strike meetings at Lillooah until the W. P. P. had taken up the strike more than three months after its inception (P. W. 230)".

I have already stated in full my relations with the other accused particularly in relation to Bauria strike. In Chengail strike I was associated with only two amongst accused, namely Messrs Radha Baman Mitra and Spratt. On one occasion only Messrs Gopendra Chakravarty and Shamsul Huda went with me to Chengail from Bauria in company with Mr. Johnstone. Excepting that occasion which is referred to in exhibits P. 24 and P 526(9) I do not remember to have met Mr. Chakravarty anywhere either at Chengail or Bauria. With regard to Mr. Radha Raman Mitra I have already stated the circumstances under which I came to be acquainted with him and how he was elected to be an office-bearer of the Chengail Jute Workers' Union. Spratt went to Chengail at my request on the first occasion that strike broke out there, shortly after the formation of the Union. It was from Mr. Radha Raman Mitra that I first came to know that the workers were very excited and their resentment at the conduct of the Manager of the Ludlow Jute Mill was so deep that they might any moment go on strike. He further told me that the dismissal of Mahadev, a very active worker of the newly formed Union, had made the situation so serious that perhaps the strike had already been declared in his absence though the workers had sent him to me with the request that I should go there. I could not go because of certain very important and unavoidable engagements,

But I wanted to send someone with Mr. Radha Raman Mitra who would be of real help to him and Mr. Bankim Mukerji the Secretary of the Union, as both of them were absolutely new in the Trade Union field and lacked experience. As time at my disposal was very short, because Mr. Mitra pointed out that delay in going might cause a very ugly situation, I thought of requesting Spratt to go with Mr. Mitra. In doing so I thought that as Spratt had come to Calcutta deputed by Trade Union Congress I could request him to help the Provincial Committee in case of urgent need, though the matter might not be very strictly within the scope of the task he was entrusted with. But subsequently Spratt himself took a great deal of interest in the strike and for about ten days that the strike continued he remained most of the time there with the Secretary, till a satisfactory settlement was arrived at in which also he was present with me and the Secretary Mr. Bankim Mukerji. Later in the evening Mr. Mitra came back from Chengail and informed me that the men had come out before he went back and so nothing could be done. It must be mentioned

here that while sending a letter requesting Spratt to accompany Mr. Mitra I also sent a short note addressed to the workers expressing to them my inability to go and exhorting them to realise, fully before they took the step that they intended taking, the consequences of the same. In this connection a word is necessary to explain the position in which a newly formed Union finds itself in a similar situation, viz when the workers go on Strike without reference to the union that is without previous decision being taken by the union for that step. In countries, particularly Great Britain, where Trade Union Movement had a long history behind it and the working class in the course of a prolonged struggle with the employers has gained experience and discipline it has come to be recognised that the workers should not go on strike unless it be declared through their respective unions. The decision is to be first arrived at in the union meeting. If now the workers or a section of workers in any particular industry go on strike without the knowledge or authority of the union the union may refuse to recognise the strike altogether. Not only that, but the union before taking up negotiations or giving its support to the strikers may insist on an unconditional resumption. But in spite of these rigid rules even British Trade Unions, except in cases where discipline demands the enforcement of these rules in the interests of the organisation, have recognised cases in which workers came out without the unions formally declaring the strike. In India the position is quite different. ~~The~~ Indian Trade Union Movement is the youngest in the world, being about ten or eleven years old. Large industries remain as yet unorganised. The workers find conditions intolerable, more so when the employers in their arrogant stupidity characterised by a lack of imagination behave in a way which wounds their susceptibilities or sentiments. They come out in a body and remain out as long as they can and then go back when driven to do so by sheer necessity. The employers also take ~~an~~ advantage of this depressed mood of the workers when they have absolutely no fight left in them and take to the process known ^{as} "combing out," that is they refuse to take back those, who being a little more spirited than the rest, ~~and~~ taken the initiative on the last occasion.

So in this condition of things when a union is first formed, the workers take to it enthusiastically as a sort of magic weapon with which to fight the employers. Even those who do not join the union are sure that the union would help them if they are in a difficulty. But that the strength of the union depends on their own support and the way in which the union is to be properly conducted, is not realised by them. In the first stage they do not realise that the strength of the union is dependent on their organised and disciplined support, and that if they have a right to be helped by the

union in all their difficulties they have a corresponding duty to the union, namely to do nothing which would weaken the union and to take no step without its being thoroughly discussed in the union executive consisting of their own representatives. This condition of things is not peculiar to India. As a matter of fact in the early stages of the British Trade Union Movement the pioneers of the British Trade Union had to face this problem, and even now, though instances are few and far between, strikes have been declared first, leaving the union no option but either to ratify or repudiate it. To repudiate a strike and leave the workers in the lurch, even though they have committed a blunder, is a serious thing to do and ~~the~~ union executive would venture to do it unless there is an unanswerable case warranting the decision.

This was the position at Chengail. I at once realised the situation, because I had enough experience of Trade Unions by that time to become familiar with the tactics often resorted to by the employers, namely to measure their strength with a union newly formed rather than to wait till it has time to get organised. So, as I propose to show in connection both with Changail and Bauria, while the organisers of the union did their level best to avoid a strike and all sorts of friction because this would hamper the task of organisation, the employers did their best to goad the men to a strike so that they might prove the worthlessness of the union, which, in most cases not having the time to organise itself properly, collapses and the employers generally succeed in these tactics as they succeeded at Bauria. They did so after a long and stiff fight yet they could not break the Trade Union spirit which was developed in the workers. At Chengail of course a settlement was arrived at because, as I proposed to show later on, whatever might have been the attitude of the Manager at the beginning when he found that Trade Union had come to stay at Chengail he wanted to be as much friendly with the union, particularly in small matters, as his position as the Manager would allow him in the present stage of the organisation of industries. Because of the horrible condition of things prevailing in the industrial areas, which has been described very graphically by Messrs. Purcell and Halsworth and by Messrs. Johnston and Sime—the latter in particular refers to the Jute area and is corroborated by Mr. Brailsford in his deposition in this Court—because of this condition, as I have said, no genuine Trade Unionist in India, however much he might be averse to the strike except as the very last resort, can afford to sermonize the workers on their hasty action, far less to repudiate it. Right or wrong he has got to stand by the workers—see them through the fight as best as he can and when a settlement has been arrived at he might sermonize them to his hearts content. At any rate that is how I understood my duty.

and as I shall show by a reference to my later speeches at Chengail that I did spare no effort subsequently to explain to them what a Trade Union really is and that before a strike can be decided upon the management must be given an opportunity to redress the grievances. There is another thing in this connection which requires some explanation in view of what has been deposed by P. W. 27 and stated by Mr. Radha Raman Mittra—I refer to the question of S. D. O.'s suggestion. The facts are stated in the report of the Free Press published in the newspapers I intend to tender which would throw some more light on the matter. It gives the gist of the conversation I had in the meeting with the S. D. O. In order to prove to the S. D. O. that the workers had themselves placed the grievances before the management, before the Union had begun to press them on their behalf, I addressed the workers and told them in their presence of the S. D. O. what he has just told me. I placed before them as impartially as I could the implications of the proposal made by the S. D. O. While I emphasised that it would mean that the management would gain its point as far as its refusal to recognise the Union was concerned at least for the present, I also pointed out that the Union was bound to be recognised sooner or later if the workers themselves continued to remain loyal to the Union and realised that this willingness to receive their deputation for the first time in their experience was due to the fact of their having formed a Union. With regard to the likelihood of their grievances being redressed I told them frankly that I could not assure them on this point as the S. D. O. himself said to me that he had no authority to commit the management, but that it was for them to decide whether to accept the offer of the S. D. O. and send a deputation with him. After me Mr. Mittra addressed the meeting.

In this connection a word or two ^s are necessary on the question of the recognition of Union. In the history of Trade Union Movement of every country it has been seen that two of the most important problems that the pioneers of the Movement had to face were the recognition by the Government of the Trade Unions as corporate bodies having the rights and liabilities of other corporate bodies. For this recognition the British Trade Unions had to fight for over half a century against the apathy of the Government based on the principle of 'laissez fair' (which was interpreted by Charles Dickens as "every one for himself and devil take the hindmost") and subsequently when the Legislation took the matter up and passed the Trade Union Acts in 1871—76, the Acts were interpreted in such a way by the Judiciary as to render them wholly useless for the purpose for which they were passed. The fight

continued till 1913 when the Trade Disputes Act of 1906 was followed by the Trade Union Act of 1913 which gave the Trade Unions certain clear statutory rights which could not be demolished by ~~the~~ judicial ingenuity. Certain of these rights have been curtailed again by the Trade Disputes Act of 1927 passed by the Conservative Government after the General Strike. But the second problem which involved the fight for recognition by employers was no less keen than that which involved the fight for statutory recognition. The employers saw to it in England, as they did in India during the passage of the Trade Unions Act of 1926, that statutory recognition in no way involves the obligation by the employers to recognise a union registered under the Act. In England as in India recognition had to be forced out of the employers. What actually happens therefore is that while employers do not accord formal recognition in most cases they have to accord actual recognition under the stress of circumstances. Before however the actual recognition takes place there is generally a very bitter and prolonged fight during which all possible efforts are made to break the union. One of the most familiar methods of breaking the union was to employ agents who would go out among the strikers and say that the management was quite willing to redress their grievances but that their leaders were standing in the way of their going back to work for ^{their} personal prestige, particularly as they and their families have not to suffer the acute pangs of hunger as the workers on strike and their families do. In a country where the Trade Union Movement is new and the workers not accustomed to fight for their rights in a disciplined manner, these lying propagandists have a ~~demoralising~~ ^{demoralising} effect on at least a part of the workers, particularly when they have to stay out long. To me personally this last, namely, that I could not share the sufferings of the strikers, had almost the sting of a reproach even though I might not have any responsibility in the decision for a strike. Whenever therefore any offer of compromise or settlement came in the course of any strike in which I had any voice, instead of deciding for the workers as to whether they should accept or reject it, I would explain to them, as fully and as impartially as I was capable of doing, the implications of the offer—what they might accept and what they might not and leave the decision to the workers themselves.

D-19. 6. 31

It was not shirking my responsibility because whatever the decision would be I would assume full responsibility for it, but it was to make the workers realise that in the fight in which they would have to shoulder the brunt of misery and suffering, so it was ultimately for them to decide when to commence the fight, how long to fight and

when to stop fighting. Decisions made for them—if not imposed on them—would continue to make them leave matters in the hands of those whom the workers call leaders, leaving the workers free to repudiate or support them at will: that is why I did not make a fetish of the recognition of the Union being made a condition precedent to a negotiation or a settlement. I could well see through the tactics of the employers seeking to drive a wedge between Union officers and those who elected them. But I also realised that workers were no fools and I certainly had this much faith in them that they would loyally stand by those whom they themselves elected to lead them. If the workers themselves after hearing the pros and cons decided that they would stand by those they had elected and would have no negotiations or settlement unless it be through their elected representatives, it would at once be a warning to the employers that their trick would not work and at the same time strengthen the Union by the reiteration of that confidence indicated by their election as office-bearers. But the decision must be made by the workers themselves and not by the leaders on behalf of them. It was to me not merely a very fine constitutional point, but was the guiding principle in my Union activities, namely, that if the workers are to be educated as to the advantages of Trade Unions they themselves must be made to feel that the Union is not something which is outside themselves but that it is they who when organised are the Union, and that it is for them to make or mar it. The effectiveness and usefulness of the Union would depend on the loyal support they render to it. I emphasised this point in many speeches that I delivered at Chengail and Bauria, of which only one and that also is unfortunately a “gist” speech has been deposed to by P. W. 37 who fathered it jointly on me and three others: “they all four said that everyone should register himself as a member etc: etc:.....”.

However, on the 10th day the strike was settled. I was at Chengail that afternoon and was talking with Spratt and the Secretary as also some members of the Executive Committee at the Union office before going to a meeting fixed to be held in an open field adjoining when the S. D. O. came and called me aside. He asked me to use my influence for the settlement and said that the Manager would like to talk to me but that he would not see the others. I replied that I was always ready to do all that I could for a reasonable settlement but I could not see the Manager without the Secretary and Spratt who was deputed by me on behalf of the Federation. The S. D. O. went away and about half an hour after he came back and invited us to follow him. We asked the workers to wait till our return from a visit to the Manager. After three hours' discussion between the Manager and myself in the

presence of the S. D. O., with the Secretary and Spratt helping me on questions of fact arising out of discussion, the terms were agreed to and we parted with the promise that the Manager would be informed early next morning of the decision of the meeting to be held that very night as it was already very late. The meeting agreed to the terms after a great deal of discussion and resumption took place next morning after some slight hitches had been adjusted by the Secretary. I left Chengail for Calcutta by the first train available in the morning. The terms of settlement are to be found in D 174 (3) and D-174 (1).

In this connection I owe it to truth and fairness to say that I found Mr. F. W. Washington, the Manager of the Ludlow Mill—whatever might have been the conduct of the management at the initial stages of the formation of Union—different from most of the employers' agents in this that, within the limitations imposed on him by his position as a Manager, he was more tactful and reasonable than others of his kind with whom I had occasion to come into touch. Many little pin-pricks which when accumulated aggravate the discontent due to the permanently unsatisfactory condition of the workers and drives them to declare strike was avoided. There were two more strikes there—of which one was declared by the women workers, who complained that the Head-clerk had promised them some increment which was not fulfilled, and because of the nature of the work they performed they held up the working of the entire Mill by this declaration of the strike. The other was due to dismissal of about 50 workers. But the last was very short-lived as I told the workers that it was no use having a Union, if they went on declaring a strike without first of all having the matter discussed at Union meetings and without giving the Union Executive an opportunity to see what could be done in the matter of negotiation. I had told them repeatedly after the settlement of the first strike (after the organisation of the Union) which showed them the contrast between strike conducted in an organised way and the previous strike (in March 1928 with which we had nothing to do) which ended in a debacle—I told them that the strike is a weapon the successful use of which depended as much on the solidarity and organisation of the workers as on the rarity of its use. The fear of a strike conducted by powerful Union is more productive of results than the strike itself. In spite of this when the second strike broke out I had to condone that, firstly because those responsible for it were women not many of whom had as yet joined the Union, secondly because the Secretary of the Union was absent for some days when the strike was declared. But the reason which most weighed with me in giving my support as the Secretary of the B. T. U. F. to the strike was the terrorism practised by the Police.

It was of such a scandalous nature as to bring the District Magistrate himself on the spot for an inquiry. We were requested by the District Magistrate, Mr. Guru Saday Dutt, to be present at the inquiry conducted by the S. D. O. in his presence. The District Magistrate also requested me to try for a settlement and the Manager who was there said that he was ready to talk over matters. But the difficulty in that case arose because the Manager was not prepared to admit that any promise was made to the women, on the ground that he did not authorise the Head-clerk or any other man to make such a promise. I had no reason to disbelieve the Manager but I had also every reason to believe the women, and it was quite probable that the Head-clerk might have exceeded his authority in appeasing the women for the time being who had threatened to join the Union in a body if their wages were not increased. I asked the Manager in the presence of the District Magistrate whether he was prepared to vouch for his Head-clerk that he did not say such a thing, and of course the Manager said he could not. I suggested an inquiry to be undertaken by the Manager himself in the presence of a Union officer to ascertain the truth of the matter. The Manager could not agree to this at the time and the negotiations broke down. In the meantime a number of cases as is usual in all strikes was instituted by the Police on the complaint of the Manager charging a number of the women with rioting, 'hat' looting etc: and some of the men also were lumped together in a separate case, including the Secretary himself whose fault was that in taking some of the *Durjans* to task for assaulting the men indiscriminately near the market he got hurt himself. Subsequently the Manager agreed to hold an inquiry in the presence of Mr. Latafat Husain, the Vice-President of the Union, but the matter did not proceed further because the women got some concessions. But the cases were not withdrawn through both the District Magistrate and the Manager were willing because, as often happens in this country, the Police stood on their prestige, more particularly because some of their little doings were exposed in connection with this strike. However, though the cases ended in conviction of most of the accused as strike cases generally do, some of them including the Secretary were acquitted on appeal and in the case of the others the sentences were reduced. The case of the women workers was sent back for retrial because they being all Telegu speaking did not understand the proceedings at all and no step was taken to explain the same to them. As soon as the decision of the Appellate Court was given I wrote to Mr. Washington and subsequently saw him at Calcutta at the Head-office of the company and pressed him for withdrawal of the case,

otherwise, I pointed out it would smack of vindictiveness. After some discussion he agreed and promised to send me a draft, which after I had seen, he would send to the District Magistrate with any alternation that I might suggest. I was indisposed at the time when it was sent and could not attend to it and so he sent it as it was, as would appear from D 255 dated 2-11-28.

In this connection I should also mention that since July 1928 a *sardar* called Halim was proving himself a nuisance to the workers. He used to extort heavy bribes on threat of dismissal, he would blackmail the men because they had joined the Union, and his abuse and rudeness had gone to such a length that whenever I would go to Chengail many members of the Union would complain against him. I promised to take the matter up with the Manager and D 257 dated 18-8-28 was the reply of the Manager to my letter. The Sardar was, subsequently dismissed to the relief of the workers. I was referring to this incident in D 179 (3) in the course of a speech I delivered at the meeting which was held to consider the steps to be taken to put an end to the tyrannies of another *Sardar*. I pointed out to the workers that these were comparatively minor details and did not call for such a drastic measure as a strike undoubtedly is. I exhorted them not to go on a strike till the Manager had an opportunity to look into the matter and I reminded them of a previous occasion when he did take action with regard to another Sardar at my instance after I had given him duly authenticated facts regarding that Sardar's mis-deeds. On this occasion also I succeeded in having the Sardar removed.

There was a third strike as I have already said. I do not exactly remember when the Strike began and ended. But I am prepared to accept the statement of P. W. 37 that there was a Strike from 19th November to 4th December. This time also the Secretary was absent because of illness. The Manager posted a notice announcing that the services of fifty men from different departments had been dispensed with. The workers went on strike. I was informed about it two or three days later by some of the workers who came to me on behalf of the strikers. When I learnt from them that no Union meeting was called and no decision taken after due discussion and that no representations were made through the Union as regards the dismissals before the strike was declared, I was very angry. Let it be understood that I was angry not because the strike was declared, because arbitrary dismissals have got to be resisted even if the resistance took the form of strike. But I was angry because on the two former occasions when a strike was declared without the previous sanction of the Union I had repeatedly told them that on ^{future} ~~future~~ occasions if this

happened it would not be possible for me to lend my support to them as the Secretary of the Federation. It should be noted in this connection that the Unions at Chengail and Bauria being organised directly by the Federation under a mandate from the A. I. T. U. C. it was up to me to see that until these were affiliated to the A. I. T. U. C. after due compliance with the one year rule, that these Unions were following the well-established principles and traditions of the Trade Union Movement recognised in every country. But as I have already pointed out that before the Trade Union spirit is developed in the workers through propaganda and experience it would not be proper or expedient to refuse to help the workers out of their difficulties. I went to Chengail the same day or the day after and after addressing a meeting in which I said again what I had said so many times about the impropriety of the procedure adopted by them, I promised to see the Manager and let them know the result of the interview. I made an appointment with him at his Calcutta Office but that interview unfortunately was productive of no result. The Manager had information that the strike was declared without the sanction of the Union and that was naturally used by him as a trump card. But I told him frankly that though this was so yet I had no option but to stand by them, particularly because from the enquiry I made I agreed with the men that the dismissals were arbitrary and at least one half of the men in the list were active workers of the Union. Shortly after it may be that very day or day after I wrote to the Secretary a letter which is P 117. I may add here that Mr. Carter referred to by the Manager in D 257 was also present throughout the interview but he did not take a very active part in the discussions. However after the deadlock which continued for some time I saw the Manager again by an appointment at the Head Office and this time he promised to take a few of the workers shortly, after though he did not specify dates, while with regard to the others he gave me his word that he would take them but could not say when. He said he was prepared to tell me in confidence the plan he would adopt provided I did not disclose it to the workers. I declined his kindly meant confidence with this condition because it was rather awkward for me as a Trade Unionist to be told things like this which I would be bound by promise not to disclose to the workers. This was the utmost concession I could secure from him and while I could hold out to him no promise of a settlement I promised him to do my best for the calling off of the strike. I called a meeting the day after and explained to the men the position. I emphasised on the difficulties of a Trade Union representative negotiating with the employers on behalf of a Union which had not declared the strike. I explained to them,

that without loyalty to the Union and disciplined obedience to the Union which is nothing but the workers acting in an organised way, the Union is nothing but a make-believe and it only tempts the employers to flout it and break it altogether. I then gave them a summary of what took place in the interview and the final terms offered by the Manager. I told them that this was the utmost that could be secured at present but I told them that personally I believed that though the promise was vague yet it would be carried out as far as the Manager was concerned. I placed before them the alternative of indefinite suffering. At the same time I considered it my duty to praise them for the proof of the solidarity they had given, though I pointed out they had done the right thing in a wrong way. The workers decided by very large majority upon resumption. The strike was called off at the beginning of December. In the course of a fortnight about 20 men were taken in batches. Some more were taken in January and some in February. After my arrest I was told that many more were taken. On the resumption after the General Strike in June 1929 all victimised workers were taken back and the terms offered by the Manager of this Mill were better than those offered by the Jute Mills Association. I gave a somewhat lengthy account of my Chengail activities to prove that the management of a mill which has tact and seeks to fulfil its pledges honourably can even in the present rotten system which governs production do something to create better relations between Capital and Labour. I have another object in view which would furnish a contrast with what happened at Bauria. I may also mention here that though at first I intended to re-organise the Champdani Labour League with the help of the grant made by the A.I.T.U.C. I began organisation work at Chengail because Mr. Latafat Hussain the General Secretary of the Kankinara Labour Union came to me with a deputation of the Chengail workers who were on strike with a request that the Federation should help them. But the first day that I paid a visit to Chengail with Mr. Latafat Husain and Indu Bhushan Sircar, the organising Secretary of the Press Employees Association, we found that the strike was on the point of collapse and nothing could be done. So we decided to form a Union at Chengail where previously there was no attempt to organise the workers. P 696 which purports to be a letter from Spratt to me without date seems to have been recovered from the Chengail Union Office. ^{Eventually} ~~Evidently~~ this letter was not sent to me for some reason or other and did not leave the Union's office till it was removed by the search officer. But from the contents it seems that the letter was written during the first strike within two or three days of the meeting held on the 24th April. P 118 which seems to be a diary recovered from the search of Mr. Radha Raman Mitra's

house refers to the June Strike at Chengail as the third strike while in my statement I have described it all through as the second strike. The reason is that I was referring to strikes in which I was concerned whereas Mr. Mitra includes the strike of March with which, as I have already said, we had nothing to do and which ended in unconditional resumption on the 9th or 10th of March. As that strike broke out and ended before the Federation had undertaken organisation work at Chengail, I did not consider it necessary to refer to it.

Now I come to Bauria. In regard to Bauria I must first refer to the report I submitted to Mr. N. M. Joshi namely D 285 (2) with a covering letter D 285 (1), drafts of which were found in my search. These two documents speak for themselves. I must point out that the report was written about five months before my arrest at the request of the General Secretary who before he complied with my request to him to appeal to British Trade Union Congress, Dundee Jute Workers' Union and the International Federation of Trade Unions, at Amsterdam, called for a report from the Provincial Secretary who undertook the organisation work under the direct mandate of the Executive Council of the A.I.T.U.C. That the report was approved of at the Head Quarters, has been fully borne out by the fact that Mr. Joshi sent out an appeal as a result of which help was sent out by the British Trade Union Congress of which I was informed by Mr. N. M. Joshi in a letter dated 7th March 1929 marked D 208 (11). The relief came a little late. But the point is that it came and came in pursuance of an appeal by the General Secretary based on my report which I trust the Court would read carefully. I may also claim that the appeal dated 26th January 1929 issued by R. R. Bakhle at the instance of the General Secretary, who was then ill, to the Trade Unions of India and the one dated 24th January 1929 issued by Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru, D 208 (6), were both based on my report and indicate that the T.U.C. Head Quarters fully supported me in the policy I was pursuing in the carrying out of the Congress mandate. I claim the full responsibility for the conduct of the strike which developed from lockout and further claim that it was a strike conducted on the most approved principles of Trade Unionism. It has been suggested by the Prosecution and the suggestion has been accepted with approval by the learned Inquiry Magistrate that it was the Workers' and Peasants' Party of Bengal which primarily conducted the strikes and that I helped them. I have noticed throughout in this case that it has suited the Prosecution always to give credit where it is not due. In other words and I say this with full responsibility of what I am saying, the whole case is based on a theory and facts have been manipulated.

to suit that theory and the facts which do not support that theory have either been withheld or ignored. It was in pursuance of that theory that the credit for organising the Congress demonstrations was shifted to the Workers' and Peasants' Party instead of to Mr. K. C. Mitra. It was in pursuance of that theory that the credit of organising the Jute workers at Chengail and Bauria was sought to be given to the Workers' and Peasants' Party and it was for this reason that the Workers' and Peasants' Party was given the credit of bringing me to Lillooah. And all this was done, as I have shown and propose to show in the face of exhibits which the Prosecution themselves have placed before the Court. The learned Magistrate found it more convenient and less tiresome to accept the Prosecution theory than sift the facts for himself and in doing so naturally he found that my case presented "some difficulties" and in attempting to get out of the difficulties he involved himself in contradiction. That contradiction was no where so conspicuous as when he deals with my activities in Chengail and Bauria. In page 271 the learned Magistrate observes "Trade Union activity apart from that carried on in conjunction with the W. P. P. does not concern this case. It is proved, and he (Kishori Lal) does not deny it, that he took part with the other accused, or rather some of those from Bengal, in the Lillooah Strike, the Chengail Strikes and Bauria Strike," and then further he has been pleased to remark, "the Secretary of the B. T. U. F. might find nothing strange in attending such strikes and meetings and of course it is not suggested that the accused were the only speakers or persons present. In particular he might legitimately go to the meetings in connection with the Chengail and Bauria strikes, because in both cases he was an office bearer of the Unions concerned and the Unions were founded under a direct mandate from the Congress: the Bauria Union was affiliated to B. T. U. F. in opposition to the wishes of the W. P. P." I need not point out the contradictory character of the observations in the two paragraphs that I have quoted successively. While explaining the character of my connection with the Workers' and Peasants' Party I have already shown that P 2419 referred to by the learned Magistrate supports my contention and does not at all support the inference he seems to have drawn from it. As I have already in that connection dealt exhaustively with the part played by the Bengal Jute Workers' Association supported by the Workers' and Peasants' Party I need not say anything here except to summarise the whole position with reference to the two observations quoted above.

The Bauria Union was formally formed on the 15th of July 1928 and the Chengail Union on 18th March (D. 84 (7) & (8)) of the same year being directly organised by the Provincial Committee

under the mandate of A. I. T. U. C. Its position was different from other Unions not yet affiliated to the Congress or its Provincial Committee. The learned Magistrate's qualified permission that I might legitimately go to meetings at Chengail and Bauria because in both cases I was an officer-bearer, indicates that he had rather vague and confused notions of my connection with these two Unions and the duties and obligations which that connection involved. As a matter of fact as the Secretary of Bengal Trade Union Federation my responsibilities and obligations with regard to these two Unions were far greater than would have been the case if I were a mere office-bearer, like others, and if, as the Prosecution suggests, the W. P. P. were running the Union or conducting the strike. The 'Legal Adviser' to a Union seldom does the things I did in regard to the Chengail Jute Workers' Union, and the workers in a Union never run up to their Legal Adviser for help and advice on any other matter than those which are strictly within the scope of a lawyer. The notices of most of the meetings both at Chengail and Bauria even after the Unions were formed were generally issued by me as the Secretary of the Bengal Trade Union Federation. If I were a mere puppet President of the Bauria Jute Workers' Union dancing to the tune of W.P.P. or B.J.W.A. I certainly would not have been flayed alive as I was in "Ganavani" and the "Inprecorr" nor would the Federation of which I was Secretary have come in for so many uncomplimentary adjectives as it did at the hands of the Party and its organ. The policy that I pursued was that while agreeing to differ with the party and B. J. W. A. on their principles and views I asked for their cooperation for the success of the strike, and in order to put an end to Trade Union rivalry was prepared to undertake that after the strike was settled and the Union placed on a firm footing the question of the amalgamation and re-organisation of these different Jute Unions should be taken up (P 24). They did not accept my offer and went on in their own way which led to friction which was more and more accentuated. Let me reiterate that the Workers' and Peasants' Party as such had absolutely nothing to do with these Unions or the strike, that these unions conducted the strike under the lead of the Federation. They might have addressed a few meetings over which I or Mr. Mrinal Kanti Bose, the President of the Federation, presided, but some of their members on most occasions used to visit Bruria when I was not there and on comparatively very few occasions did any of them take part in meetings at which I was present. The Federation did not recognise the right of any other body to interfere with matters which the Federation considered its own concern in the ordinary course of its duties. By taking up that attitude the Federation was not doing anything unusual nor in asking for the help of some members of the Workers' and Peasants'

Party which did not come was the Secretary acting in a way inconsistent with the policy of the Federation. It was pursuing a course of policy and action well recognised by all public organisations. Each organisation is formed with ideals and principles, loyalty to which is expected from its members or constituents as long as they continue to be so. It sets before itself certain duties and obligations which give the tone and colour to its activities in the pursuit of those aims, ideals and principles. Often it so happens that certain organisations with different aims and objects find themselves acting in cooperation in certain matters on which there is agreement up to a certain point. That is why the Bengal Provincial Congress Committee sought co-operation from the Bengal Trade Union Federation in the matter of organising a Campaign against the Simon Commission—both the Indian National Congress and the All India Trade Union Congress being pledged to the boycott of the Commission. That is why the Bengal Trade Union Federation could not ignore the letter formally addressed to its Secretary by the Workers' & Peasants' Party on the need of organising opposition to the Trade Disputes Bill and the Public Safety Bill, though in this matter, which from the nature of the Bill it appears, being its primary concern it could not abdicate its leadership, any more than the B. P. C. C. could abdicate its leadership in the campaign against the Simon Commission. I have to give these rather obvious facts and conventions familiar even to a tyro in public life to clear the mis-conception that has arisen in connection with my case. I have always maintained and still do maintain that during strike it is possible for—nay it is the bounden duty of all schools of thought within the working-class movement to combine for the limited objective of making the strike a success. The man who or the party which fails to do it forfeits the right to claim as a friend of Labour, however much he or it might indulge in high sounding platitudes to cover or justify the failure to help. I myself acted on this principle throughout as the Secretary of the Federation as would be evidenced by the efforts made by Mr. Mrinal Kanti Bose and myself respectively as the President and Secretary of the Federation for bringing about a settlement between the Scavengers' Union and the Calcutta Corporation as soon as the Union asked for our help in the matter. I expected others also to do the same, however much they might otherwise differ from me or the Body of which I was the Secretary, in views I hold or represent and the policy I carry out. There was no, nor there could be any, from the nature of things, ulterior motive or object behind all this except to make the strike a success by a settlement under which some of the most outstanding grievances of the workers might be redressed. This would be clear from D 210, the letter that I addressed to Messrs. Kettlewell and Bullen, the managing

agents of the Fort Gloucester Mill, and a Press cutting D 179 (2) which contains a report of a meeting attended by one Mr. Cameron with an offer for settlement. My position in regard to the Bauria strike as officially recognised by the A.I.T.U.C. was different from what the Prosecution seek to assign to me. This would be evident from D 296 which contains messages from Pt. Jawahar Lal Nehru, President of the A.I.T.U.C. during the year 1929, to the Bauria workers enclosed with a covering letter to the Secretary B.T.U.F., 34 Bow Bazar Street Calcutta. This was further recognised by Mr. Daud, the Chairman of the Jheria Session of the A.I.T.U.C. who in a letter to me dated 9.11.28 (D 244) assures me that he would deal with the activities of the Federation in his speech and what he was kind enough to call my "untiring energy in organising the Jute Workers in Bauria and other places." This is what he said in the course of his Presidential address at Jheria while dealing with Provincial Labour Federation:— "the Jute Workers of Bauria have been organised under the auspices of the Bengal Trade Union Federation. Immediately after its inception the new born organisation had to face immeasurable difficulties at the hands of the employers. In connection with the recent strike the officers and the workers were subjected to humiliation and put to great troubles for their supporting the cause of the workers. I congratulate the workers on their signal success in rallying round their Trade Union in spite of great opposition from the employers. The strike is still continuing and the workers are forming their demands. The President Mr. Mrinal Kanti Bose and the Secretary Mr. Kishori Lal Ghosh of the Federation deserve our congratulations for the way how they are steering through the difficulties."

There is also a number of letters and telegrams to me from Messrs N.M. Joshi and Bakhle indicating that the T.U.C. headquarters also had recognised that the Bauria Jute Worker's Union occupied a different position from other un-affiliated Unions and being organised by the Provincial Committee acting through its Secretary under the mandate of the Congress was entitled to as much help as the Congress could reasonably give (see Exhs D 208 (1), (2), (3), (4), (6), (7), (9), (11), (18), among and (19) amongst others). But a contrast with the way in which Unions affiliated to the Congress or the Congress itself was helping the workers through the Secretary of the Federation is furnished by the manner in which the G.K.U. money was disposed of. I have already referred that it was Mr. Bradley who promised at the Executive Council meeting at Jheria a donation of rupees one hundred "on his own responsibility" on behalf of this Union. I reminded Mr. Bradley when he came down to Calcutta after the Jheria Congress of his promise of help. He asked me to write to Mr. Dange who, I was

informed, was the General Secretary of the Union. I wrote to Dange P. 86 which also, as I propose to show, has been misinterpreted by the Prosecution. There is a photographic copy of the same letter put in by the Prosecution as Exhibit P. 1628 P. This photographic copy is of interest only with regard to its envelope which would show that I directed the letter c/o the Trade Union Congress office. As a matter of fact all the letters, mostly circular letters, that I had occasion to address to the Bombay Trade Unionists in connection with the Bauria strike were directed to the Congress office.

Mr. Dange continued to maintain silence and did not think it fit to reply to my letter. It was through Mr. Bakhle who sent me a wire that I came to know (D. 208 (8)) that a sum of Rs 500/- was sent to Mr. Muzaffar Ahmad by the Girni Kamgar Union. I sent a note at once to Mr. Muzaffar Ahmad asking for the money because of the immediate needs in connection with the conduct of the cases. He wrote back (P. 70) saying that he had wired for further instructions. I went to European Asylum Lane next morning and told him that whatever might be the instructions sent in reply to his wire he had no right to withhold at least the specific sum of Rs 100/- which was promised by Mr. Bradley at Jheria on behalf of the Union. After consultation with Spratt Mr. Muzaffar Ahmad handed over to me the sum (P. 416 (8)). I need not go into details over the unhappy controversy that grew out of this nor need I add anything to what has transpired in the records. D 565 was the letter which I wrote to Dange and which was recovered from his possession and this letter conveys my views on the subject. But the Prosecution as usual, and unfortunately the learned Magistrate also, have failed to draw the only legitimate conclusion which is logically deducible from this episode. Mr. Dange who was the Asstt. Secretary of the A.I.T.U.C. as well as the General Secretary of the Girni Kamgar Union, in his loyalty to his party, namely the Workers' and Peasants' Party, did not send the money to the Secretary of the Provincial Committee of the A.I.T.U.C. or through the treasurer of the A.I.T.U.C., as many other Unions like the Jamshedpur Union (D 208 (9)) and the G.I.P. Railway Union did, but to Mr. Muzaffar Ahmad. Mr. Muzaffar Ahmad straightway ignored the Provincial Committee of the A.I.T.U.C. of which he was recently at Jheria elected a Vice-President, and began to act on his own responsibility. This Mr. Muzaffar Ahmad would never have done had the relations between the Workers' and Peasants' Party and the Bengal Trade Union Federation been otherwise than what they were. But the learned Magistrate of course could find no other inference to draw from it than that Mr. Muzaffar Ahmad and myself were having some personal quarrel over this.

There was some correspondence over another matter which gave rise to a lot of misunderstanding and that was a telegram over joint names of Messrs. Spratt and Radha Raman Mitra to Mr. Saklatwala of the Workers' Welfare League. When I came to know of this telegram being sent I disapproved of it because as the Secretary of the Provincial Committee I must obey the Resolutions that are passed by the Congress from time to time. At its Cawnpore Session the Executive Council of the Congress passed a resolution to the effect that no individual union or person should approach any foreign body for help unless it be through the National Organisation, that is the A.I.T.U.C. (274, page 6). This brings me to the attitude I maintained throughout in regard to the financial help to Union conducting a strike--whether the said help comes from abroad or from another union at home. I have always found that it obviates much misunderstanding and avoids disputes if all remittances are made through the central or as it is called in Trade Union language the National Organisation which in India till the date of my arrest was the A.I.T.U.C. If a Union expected help from the A. I. T. U. C. it is but fair that the Congress should know how matters stood with regard to the union and the response it was getting to its appeal. It is also fair to the A. I. T. U. C. that it should know which of the foreign organisations were helping and to what extent. It would also ensure proper discipline and coordination in the Movement which are so necessary for strengthening the organisations as well as for the success of the strikes. That I was right was proved by many incidents which should not have happened if all the unions or the responsible office-bearers had been loyal to the Congress. I might refer to one incident: in P. 696 which is a letter from Muzaffar Ahmad to Dange, after justifying his withholding the Girmi Kamgar Union money from me Muzaffar Ahmad refers to Rs. 150/- from Dundee Jute Workers' Union which was alleged to have been received by me. Now I had never directly approached any foreign body for help in pursuance of the Congress Resolution nor did I receive any money from any foreign organisation. In P. 24 (page 9) I asked Mr. Joshi to inquire from the Dundee Jute Workers' Union as to whether they received any appeal for help from the Bengal Jute Workers' Union for the help of the Bauria strikers, because I understood from a conversation with Mr. Gopendra Chakravarty, to whom I also referred in an exhibit, that the Dundee Jute Workers' Union had sent some help to the Bauria workers through Mr. Kali Das Bhattacharji. Now Mr. Muzaffar Ahmad, at the period when he was writing this letter, and most of his party were not on good terms with the Bengal Jute Workers' Association. Of course how the money for which he in another letter demanded an account from Mr. Kali Das Bhattacharji could be referred in connection with me

I cannot say. But all these misunderstandings would certainly be avoided if there is one central organisation through which an appeal is sent and help received. In the records here I found several other appeals for help to have been sent by Mr. Radha Raman Mittra of which I knew nothing.

[Note—(1) As 3-30 P. M. accused said he was sorry he was not ready to go on as his notes were not fully prepared. The court therefore adjourned early.]

(Sd.) R. L. Yorke.

Note—(2) Accused's statement was broken off at this point owing to his falling ill with influenza after recovery from which he asked for an extended rest on ground of feeble health.

(Sd.) R. L. Yorke.

D/- 3-8 31.

In this connection I should like to say something about my attitude towards help from outside organisation. As would appear from the summary of a speech reported in the 'Englishman' of 26th April 1928 delivered by me at a meeting in Wellington Square, presided over by Mr. C. F. Andrews, the then President of A. I. T. U. C. (P. W. 53), I considered it rather humiliating that outside Labour organisations should be approached for help unless and until it was found that the response from the country itself was very poor and inadequate for the occasion and the occasion itself was so important that it carried with it its own justification for such an appeal for help. But even when circumstances do justify the appeal to be addressed to outside organisations for help, in the interests of discipline and solidarity no such appeal should be addressed by any Union directly but through the All-India Trade Union Congress which, as it was then, I considered to be the central body and the national organisation of the Indian Trade Union Movement. As a matter of fact I was one of those who strongly supported the resolution passed by the Executive Council of A. I. T. U. C. at Cawnpore (D. 274, page 6) namely "that no Trade Union affiliated to the A. I. T. U. C. shall appeal for funds to the International Labour Movement or carry on official communications with that movement except by way of exchanging documents and information unless such appeals and communications are sent officially through the General Secretary of the A. I. T. U. C. This rule shall not apply to the Unions which are affiliated to the International Federation in which case such unions have freedom to make appeals for funds to such Federation independently."

Now it should be noted that though on a liberal interpretation of the resolution the Bauria Jute workers' Union which was not affiliated to the A. I. T. U. C was not bound by it, yet, as I pointed out more than once, the position of the Chengail and Bauria Jute-workers' Unions was different from other non-affiliated unions in the sense that they were organised directly by the Provincial Committee of the A. I. T. U. C in pursuance of the demand of the Central Executive. There was another occasion in which I protested against the procedure adopted in an appeal for help which also was sent without my knowledge. I refer to the appeal that was addressed to R. I. L. U by Messrs. K. C. Mitra, Spratt and Muzaffar Ahmad. But here my disapproval did not and could not take any other form than a mere remonstrance because the E. I. Railway Union was affiliated to the Congress but not to the Federation, the reason being that Railway unions from the nature of things have their branches in more than one province and the A. I. T. U. C. had not yet defined the relationship between a Railway union and the Provincial Committee of the A. I. T. U. C. of the province in which a branch on the head quarters of the union might happen to be.

P. 43 is a diary book for 1929 and certain entries on certain dates have been put in by the Prosecution. The telegram ^{received} ~~received~~ from Bakhale referred to here is D 208 (8). It did not strike the learned Magistrate, I cannot help remarking incidentally, that the information about the Girni Kamgar Union money being sent to Muzaffar Ahmad was given to me not by Bradley or Dange but by Mr. Bakhale. I doubt whether I should have heard of the money at all till perhaps considerably later, and that too perhaps in the course of some casual conversation as I came to learn about the money sent by the Dundee Jute Workers' Union or of the wire sent to Mr. Saklatwala, if Mr. Bakhale who possibly had his own views on the procedure adopted in the name of the Girni Kamgar Union, had not sent me the information. That Bakhale had some misgivings which prompted him to wire to me at once the information is confirmed by the comment in a letter dated 9. 2. 29 addressed to me by Mr. N. M. Joshi (D. 208 (4)) wherein he states "of course the Communist Union in Bombay does not want to hand over the money to you, perhaps Bakhale has already informed you about it."

In this connection I must say that if Mr. N. M. Joshi had seen the proceedings of the G. K. Union (P. 958) regarding this matter he would certainly have substituted the words "Communists" for "Communist Union". The resolution itself though very loosely worded does not indicate anything which in the least

suggests that the money should be sent to Mr. Muzaffar Ahmad. It would be quite legitimate to conclude that Mr. A. A. Alve, the President of the Union, being a worker himself and knowing from his own experience the sufferings of workers on strike, and most of the members of the committee, being workers like himself, felt very keenly for the troubles of the Bauria workers and wanted sincerely to help them, and mere party considerations which, as it has been my experience, weigh with Communists so much, had very little weight with them (i. e. Mr. Alve and his fellow-workers). I doubt whether Mr. Alve acknowledged at all the right of the Workers' and Peasants' Party to impose its decisions on the Union of which he was the President. I doubt very much whether Mr. Bradley stated before the Managing Committee his views as to how the money should be sent or to whom and why. He says that Mr. S. A. Dange sent the money to Mr. Muzaffar Ahmad on his advice. But the question is whether the advice was available to the Managing Committee. The two letters which Mr. S. A. Dange addressed to Mr. Muzaffar Ahmad, (P. 395 (1) (2)), containing instructions as to the disposal of money, contain no reference to the Managing Committee, and we may take these instructions to be the result of Mr. Bradley's advice to Mr. Dange. P. 395 (2) informs Mr. Muzaffar Ahmad that the Managing Committee of the ~~C. K. U.~~ sanctioned Rs 1000/- and authorised Mr. S. A. Dange, the General Secretary to send this first instalment of Rs 500/-. There is no mention as to whom the money is to be sent according to the directions of the Managing Committee or whether the Managing Committee had authorised the General Secretary to send the money to Mr. Muzaffar Ahmad. While Mr. Dange takes particular care to describe himself as the General Secretary, he does not give any description of Mr. Muzaffar Ahmad in either of the two letters. In P 395 (1) which bears the same date there are certain instructions as to the 'channel' through which "this assistance should be utilised." I do not know to whom "you" in this passage refers. Does it mean Mr. Muzaffar Ahmad alone or Mr. Muzaffar Ahmad in consultation with the W. P. P. Executive in Calcutta? Mr. Muzaffar Ahmad's view as expressed in P 73 that "I am personally responsible, not the Workers' and Peasants' Party" might or might not be correct, though I do not know how he could have concluded that I "must have known it." However the following instructions, very carefully worded, contained in P 395 (1), regarding "the channel through which this assistance should be utilised" throw considerable light on the transaction.

"If there is a union leading the strike and commanding allegiance, so much the better. If there is none such, the Party that is leading the strike correctly should see that the assistance

is rendered in right direction". Mr. Dange dotted his I's and crossed his T's carefully to avoid misunderstanding, and he did not forget to refer to the Party with a big P. When Mr. Dange writes to Mr. Muzaffar Ahmad and talks of a "Party" and of "correct lead", it is not very difficult to understand which party he had in mind. In this connection I may refer to one other exhibit indicating how Mr. Muzaffar Ahmad regarded the conduct of the Bauria Strike. In a letter to Mr. P. C. Joshi dated 9th March 1929 Mr. Muzaffar Ahmad observes "Bauria Strike was over long ago. The people who were in charge of it have scandalously failed in their duties, otherwise a strong union would have come into existence even after the collapse of ^{the} strike."

Now Mr. Bradley asserts—I do not know his source of information, because he could not be talking from a first hand knowledge of facts necessary to arrive at a correct conclusion—that the members of the Workers' and Peasants' Party and the Bengal Jute-Workers' Association were the people who were conducting the Strike. If this were so, I doubt whether Mr. Muzaffar Ahmad would have passed such a harsh verdict on the "people who were in charge of the strike". I wonder if Mr. Spratt, who was in a far better position certainly than either Mr. Bradley or Mr. Muzaffar Ahmad to ascertain the truth, would have written what he is alleged to have written in P 2419 to which I have already invited the attention of the Court. As a matter of fact the whole controversy is as unpleasant to me as harmful to the Movement, with which I am connected. I would not have gone into details, as I did not do at first, if there were no attempts to interpret facts to suit Party purpose. I can well understand the motive which might have prompted the Prosecution in doing so and I consider it may duty to challenge the perversion of facts on which the Prosecution case is built up, not by dogmatic assertions but by facts supplied by the Prosecution themselves and also by documentary evidence tendered for the defence, the documents being recovered from search. But whether from the Prosecution or from any other quarter if there is any attempt to give more than is legitimately due to any Party at the expense of the Bengal Trade Union Federation, which by its activities at Chengail and Bauria gave such a strong impetus to the Trade Union Movement in the jute area, I certainly consider it my duty to point out to all whom it may concern that facts properly substantiated speak more loudly and convincingly than mere assertions. There is another little mistake which I take this occasion to correct before I pass on from this unhappy controversy to which Mr. Bradley brought me back after I had dealt with it as lightly as possible. This little mistake is to be found in a letter dated 1st March 1929 which Mr. Muzaffar Ahmad is alleged to

have addressed to Dange (P 955 (1)) where he criticises the "Officers of the so-called union," mentions £40 from Dundee Jute Workers' Union, out of which amount probably Mr. Kalidas Bhattacharji paid Rs 250/- to Mr. R.R. Mitra, and then mentions me as failing to announce the receipt of Rs 600/- from the A. I. T. U. C. to the workers. I am again not aware as to the source of Mr. Muzaffar Ahmad's information, but if Mr. Muzaffar Ahmad had attended the Bauria Workers' meetings on several occasions I invited him he certainly would have heard me announcing the contributions not only from the A. I. T. U. C. but also from other sources. It is rather strange that for a regular newspaper reader like him the acknowledgment of the contributions as published in the press should have escaped him altogether. I am surprised that with Mr. Muzaffar Ahmad's political experience he would retail this sort of information to Dange—knowing as he does fully well how necessary it was for the workers to know in their distress as to who were helping them. It is absurd that I should refrain from telling the workers of a union formed by the Provincial Committee under a mandate of the A. I. T. U. C., that the All India Union—bigger than the big union (as the workers called the Federation) stood by them and was helping them. Particularly as it was known that some members from another union who owed ~~former~~ ^{greater} loyalty to their party than the A. I. T. U. C. were attempting to undermine the influence and prestige of this body (i.e. the A. I. T. U. C.). I believe that the reference to the money received by the B. J. W. A. in this letter would not have been made, if there were no split since the All India Party Conference.

P 43: Referring presumably to entries on the 28th February and 26th March in the Diary for 1929 (P. 43), the learned Magistrate finds it "obvious that Spratt came in and talked over important events in the life of the W. P. P. and that he (myself) had no hesitation in deputing Spratt to make some inquiries for him (P24)". Now as it appears from the records the split in the Workers' and Peasants' Party took place towards the end of December 1928 and the little talk I had with Spratt was just two months after the split, that is long after it became known through the newspapers as would appear from P 327 (1).

And even then as my note in the Diary shows Spratt was not very willing to say much. He simply "gave me hints that there is no love lost between the Party and 97 Cornwallis Street". This must have been in reply to some direct questions put by me to Spratt because of the information I had received about the re-organisation of the B. J. W. A. with its Head Office at 97 Cornwallis Street. And in view of what I had gathered from the press I wanted

to ascertain the exact relations between the W. P. P. and B. J. W. A. The information which Spratt had supplied to me as noted on the 28th February and 6th March was not wholly new to me, but it gave the authoritative confirmation of what I gathered from the press. Of course the details about Kalidas Bhattacharji or about Mr. Bankim Mukerji and R. R. Mitra were not known to me. Spratt's reluctance would appear from the fact that he told me this in two days with an interval of about a week between them and that too casually in course of conversations on various subjects, as is shown by the entry "had a talk about the inquiry he conducted, as also the position of things regarding the split". This shows how he drifted to the subject of the split. Spratt had already conducted the investigation into the affairs of several unions in pursuance of the Resolution of the Executive Committee of the A. I. T. U. C. at Delhi in February 1928, the arrangement with him being that as I was busy he should do it alone for a time. Subsequently if I considered that in regard to any particular union some more facts were necessary I would pay a visit to it or correspond with it and then after all the necessary information was collected, we would settle down to write the report after coming to an agreement amongst ourselves as to the different heads under which the report should be divided. Now with regard to some unions including the B. J. W. A. I framed a questionnaire which Spratt had lost and so in the inquiry that he made the information that I wanted was not available but before I knew that Spratt had lost the questionnaire I had considerable doubt whether he would be able to press them sufficiently for answers. In the concluding part of P 24 that is in my letter to Mr. Joshi I had given expression to these misgivings in the para containing the words "I deputed Spratt to undertake the inquiry of the unions.....I am writing to him today for coming to me with the materials collected". The learned Magistrate refers to this in suggesting that I had greater intimacy with Spratt than he or the Prosecution would like to allow. So the learned Magistrate ignores all the references to the Inquiry Committee of the Executive Committee of the A. I. T. U. C. at Delhi, which is to be found in many of the Prosecution exhibits as also in the statement I made before him, and writes that I "had no hesitation 'in deputing Spratt to make some inquiries for him (me).'" I am certainly not going to deny in whatever light the Prosecution may chose to take it that I had very close personal relations with Spratt, and this intimacy was possible because each of us exactly knew the outlook of the other and we agreed to differ on political matters. We had in our long conversations very little to talk and discuss either about the inner working of the Federation or of the Workers' and Peasants' Party but we used to have frequent talks and discussions on the Labour Movement and on other subjects.

D/- 5. 8. 31.

I have already stated in reply to a previous question the character of my relations with those of the accused who are from Bengal, but I did not in that connection mention Spratt. It is necessary that I should briefly state in this connection what my relations with Spratt were. I must preface my remarks with this that perhaps with no one in India outside his Party members Spratt had such intimate personal relations as he had with me and that I reciprocated this feeling and considered it a privilege, as I do consider it now, is a fact of which I am proud. I had graduated from the Scottish Churches' College and I studied there during the whole undergraduate period of four years and came in close touch with a few eminent professors, the products of Scottish Universities, whose scholarship, independence and many other qualities of head and heart have still kept their memory green in my mind. During my post graduate studies in the University College at Calcutta I also came in direct touch with some European professors of whom was Mr. R. N. Gilchrist professor of Sociology who was subsequently translated into the Bengal Secretariat as the Registrar of Trade Unions, and one or two of whose letters have been put in by me as Defence exhibits. In our College days we were very critical of our professors and it was only a few of them who could command the homage of our young hearts by sterling qualities. We used to read in the Indian Press from time to time of European Professors with third rate University qualifications getting better salaries than their Indian colleagues with Oxford and Cambridge qualifications. In our student days we had great respect for these two seats of learning and that respect still lingers in my mind, in spite of the fact that I have seen nothing very impressive in some of the Indian products of these two historic Universities who appear to me to be despicable snobs. When I came to learn about Spratt through the press and the leaflet issued by Messrs. Joshi, Ginwala and others in connection with the sedition case the first thought that struck me was "here is an Englishman with University qualifications who might have with some judicious efforts come out to India as a member of I. E. S. with far better prospects than many Indians who may have superior qualifications and better experience. If he had come here as a journalist and written day after day most virulent articles of an anti-Indian character in any of the British-owned papers in India no Englishman in India would have ever dreamt of having him hauled up under section 153 A. If he had written venomous articles against the Government of India for what he might choose to consider its pro-Indian policy Englishman in India would have considered any suggestion to prosecute him under section 124 A as absurd. But as he chose to cast in his lot, that is how I took it at the time, with the Indians and his innate sense

of fairness (which has been claimed as a special trait of British character) revolts against the state of things he finds in India, he is being prosecuted for opinions." When I met him for the first time at Cawnpore I was greatly attracted by him and subsequently in the many opportunities I had of cultivating his acquaintance I found it a pleasure to discuss with him various subjects, namely literature, history, Labour Movement etc. His deep scholarship, his sympathetic understanding and his gentleness of manners drew me more and more towards him. I found another trait in his character which not only raised him still higher, if possible, in my estimation, but made him extremely popular amongst the workers at Chengail. It was his complete identification with the workers and the cheerful readiness with which he would go through all the hardships to which the workers are subjected particularly during a strike. If I were 15 years younger than that I was or if I had not developed from a comparatively early age (thanks to the training I received from my revered father) an analytical bent of mind I might have become a Communist, not because of any conviction or intellectual grasp of the doctrines, but because of the fact that a man like Spratt was a Communist. A deep scholar but never pedantic, courageous but never actuated by a spirit of bravado, steadfast in his loyalty to the principles he holds dear to his heart but never bigotted, industrious and hard-working but never making a parade of his activities—Spratt is a type of man of whom any nation may be proud, who would prove an acquisition to any movement whose ideals have attracted his loyalty. As a matter of fact I never knew until the Prosecution had unfolded its case, granting that what was said is true, Spratt's real place in the Workers' and Peasants' Party. That it was he and he alone who was its intellectual leader, to whom the Party owed all its literature—much of which I was not privileged to see till I shared the prison with him and thus had occasion to listen to the late Mr. Langford James' reluctant homage in his Opening Address—would be denied by none who goes through the Prosecution exhibits. But such was his modesty that whenever I asked him meeting him after a long interval as to what he was doing with himself he would say that he was very busy about nothing in particular. Spratt from what I saw him outside and in prison is just the sort of man who, had he lived in the Middle Ages, would not abjure his faith even if stretched on the rack and subjected to all those tortures of the Inquisition invented by human ingenuity to compel a man to go to Paradise in spite of himself. He has also in a full measure the essential quality which marks out a true soldier. His loyalty to his Party made him impose upon himself an iron discipline. My criticism of him in P 24 was, as I have come to realise since, based rather on the defects of his qualities than on any essential traits in his character. His keen intellect unbiassed by

Party prejudice or bigotry led him to see the correct policy to be pursued by his Party under given circumstances. But he had not the vigour of the fanatic unhampered by the gift of a larger and broader vision, nor the persistence of an egoist who wants to carry through what *he* considers to be the correct policy, and so, as I saw it, he had to submit to policy and tactics decided upon by his Party to which he did not perhaps wholly subscribe. Spratt is indeed a unique personality who impresses everyone who comes in touch with him, and it is certainly a sad commentary on the Criminal Code of a country which is capable of being so construed as to bring within its mischief not only a person of his intellectual and moral calibre, but also a person who is proud of associating with him closely while agreeing to differ from him in his political views. That such a man as Spratt could give away valuable Party secrets to one who far from being one of the Party was fighting it and belonged to an organisation which, according to Spratt, was rather reactionary was absurd on the face of it, besides being unsupported by the Prosecution exhibits themselves, which on a fair construction prove the reverse. As a matter of fact if I were better informed as to the actual relations subsisting between the B. J. W. A. assisted by some members of the Workers' and Peasants' Party (since the All-India Workers' and Peasants' Party Conference) and the W. P. P. itself, if I were informed earlier about the exact position of Messrs. R. R. Mitra and Bankim Mukherjee with regard to the Workers' and Peasants' Party some of my letters produced as prosecution exhibits would certainly have been different from what they are. It was when the split in the W. P. P. had developed so far as to bring it within the columns of newspapers—(P 527 (1) in which 'Philip' writes to 'Dear Dutt', giving an account of the split: "we did not even reply to the statements which you must have noticed in the 'Forward'")—that I came to know of it, and Spratt in answer to straight questions gave me some facts in a rather grudging way. He did not even give me those facts which have come to my knowledge in the course of this case through P. 527 (9)—I do not know whether it was meant to be a manifesto for public circulation or a report for the Party members:—

"The dispute was settled within a few days by the return of the two members to the national Executive Committee, but it soon became apparent that the division which had been created had not been repaired. The dissident group established new headquarters. They caused to be held without the knowledge of the Party an annual meeting of the affiliated Jute Workers' Association and appointed as three of the officials Congressmen of whom the Party could not approve. After a few minor brushes in connection with payment of subscription etc. the bulk of the dissident group resigned and announced the formation of a new People's Party."

The first interesting information gathered from the above is that the B. J. W. A. did not inform the Workers' and Peasants' Party about its annual meeting. Of course the "Reactionary" Federation with which it was affiliated (though it never condescended to pay the affiliation fee) could not expect to be favoured with a notice of the meeting though all affiliated unions to it as a matter of courtesy and form, invite the President and the Secretary. However I want to draw the contrast between the above account which explains fully the extent of the breach between the B.J.W.A. and the W. P. P. after the All-India Workers' and Peasants' Party Conference and the very cautious and watered-down statement made by Spratt to me that there was no love lost between 97, Cornawallis St. and the 2/1 European Asylum Lane. The three Congressmen referred to here are of course Mr. Hemanta Kumar Bose, Secretary of North Calcutta Congress Committee, Mr. Bankim Chandra-Mukerjee, and Mr. R. R. Mitra. The last named was, it seems, up to the very time of his arrest, regarded by the W. P. P., as he was by me up to the very time of making his statement in this Court, a Congressman.

To summarise my relation with Spratt, each knew exactly where he stood with regard to the other. None had the ambition of converting the other to his views. Both were alive to the personal ties which bound each to the other—each was glad to work with the other as far as he might. This is not a unique phenomenon in public life. But while it may be too much to expect that the Prosecution or the Committing Magistrate in a conspiracy case should be familiar with the amenities and conventions of public life or political parties, it was certainly not too much to expect that they should carefully go through the records of the case so easily available to them instead of ignoring the facts and perversely interpreting documents to suit their theories and notions.

P 84: is a letter dated 3rd January—the year has been wrongly written—it must have been 1929 instead of 1928. This letter has already been referred to in connection with the Girni Kamgar Union contributions and by a reference to its photographic copy which is P. 1628P. It has been further pointed out that the letter was directed to the care of A. I. T. U. C. like other letters which I had occasion to address to Bombay Trade Unionists in connection with Bauria. I would have had no occasion to deal with it separately but for the fact that the learned Magistrate has drawn some unwarranted inferences from it. The learned Magistrate, through what process of ratiocination is known only to himself, finds in this letter a confirmation of his view that I am an accomplice of Dutt " This view (that is by addressing me as ' Dear Comrade, '

signing himself with the usual squiggle, and as "Yours fraternally" (Dutt knew that he was writing to an accomplice) is confirmed by the way in which Kishori Lal voted with the Party Bloc in the T.U.C. especially in connection with Dange's election as Assistant Secretary." Well Sir, it is indeed an irony of fate that while a Labour Government is in office at Whitehall a Magistrate at Meerut would be solemnly laying down the law that the fact that a man addresses another as 'Dear Comrade' or subscribes himself as 'Yours fraternally' is evidence of their conspiratorial connection. But that is by the way. The learned Magistrate refers to the way in which I voted with the Party Bloc though there is absolutely nothing in the records not even in the deposition of that very resourceful witness P.W.254 who was present at the Executive Council Meeting at Jharia where none but members were allowed—to indicate the "way" in which I voted. Perhaps after writing this he had some misgivings that this discovery of his might not be supported by anything in the records, so he seeks to cover it up by adding "especially in connection with Dange's election as Assistant Secretary" and cites P 86 in support of his finding, thereby conveying the impression that the evidence of the way in which I voted in the Party Bloc is also to be found in this exhibit. This is not the first or the only instance—as I have pointed out more than once particularly in connection with P 2003P and P 2419 - of the learned Magistrate citing a document in support of a finding which either does not support him at all or leads one to an inference, the very reverse what he drew. As in others, the facts of the case are found in the very document itself. Let me quote a relevant extract from it:—"We missed you very much, believe me, and were surprised to find the party for which we all know you did so much giving preference to Joglekar over you in the selection of the Assistant Secretary of the Congress. At Cawnpore I found you to be the hot favourite and Joglekar not very seriously taken. What can have happened in the meantime excepting the fact that Joglekar is hand in glove with Bradley that he would become the hot favourite at Jharia? However it is not our look-out. As soon as we found out from the statement made by Bakhale that you did not expressly express any disinclination to stand as a candidate for the Assistant Secretaryship, as we were led at first to believe from what Joglekar said, we all voted solidly for you."

I believe Sir, that English language has not so radically changed since my arrest or that it as used and understood in Calcutta is not so very different from what is current at Meerut as to justify the conclusion the learned Magistrate drew from this that I voted for the Workers' and Peasants' Party Bloc especially in regard to Dange's election. When I referred to "your party" in

addressing Dange, as the very next sentence following the extract quoted shows, and when I referred to "our supporters" in a letter addressed to Mr. Joshi P 24 which has also suffered from mis-interpretation, is there any doubt left as to whom I referred when I said that "we" solidly voted for Dange's election as an Assistant Secretary? But there is another significant fact which seems to have escaped the learned Magistrate. I refer here to two contradictory statements one made by Mr. K.N. Joglekar and another made by Mr. R. R. Bakhale. Mr. Joglekar definitely said at the meeting of the Executive Council that Mr. Dange told him that he would not like to be re-elected or would not be able to work as Assistant Secretary while Mr. Bakhale challenged Mr. Joglekar's statement and with equal emphasis said that he had quite a different impression from his talk with Mr. Dange before he (that is Bakhale) left for Jharia, from what was sought to be conveyed by Mr. Joglekar. Not only this, I began the letter with the following "Bakhale must have by this time given you an account of what took place at the E.C. meeting at Jharia". Now I submit that even a cursory reading of the letter would lead a man to arrive at a finding quite different from that of the learned Magistrate.

There is another matter comparatively not very important which requires mention in connection with this letter namely the reference in the second paragraph to the 25 letters about the Bauria Strike. P 983 dropped out by the Prosecution but restored by me is the letter referred to, which I sent to all prominent Trade Unionists such as Mr. Shiva Rao, Diwan Chaman Lal, Rai Sahab Chandrika Prasad etc. Dange, Bradley and Jhabwala were also amongst them. The letters addressed to them were directed to the care of Mr. N.M. Joshi because I did not know of another address to which letters to Bombay Trade Unionists might be sent. This is another instance which shows that I did not regard the Trade Union Movement as the patrimony of any particular individual or party belonging to a particular school of thought. Everybody who is so inclined may come and help. I was no more averse to ask help from Bradley as of right than from Rai Sahib Chandika Prasad as long as they have taken active part in the Trade Union Movement. To abuse every other party than one's own as traitors to the working class movement and to advertise one's own party as the only saviour of the working class and as such entitled to its leadership, might be good tactics, which may work well for some time and delude a number of hard-working and long-suffering workers. But as my experience during the last three years before my arrest has shown and also as what I have learnt since my arrest about the position of the Trade Union Movement in Bombay and Bengal has shown, to quote Abraham Lincoln's famous saying, "You can

deceive some of the men all the time or all the men for some time but not all the men all the time." It does not take long to find out that there is as much difference between high-sounding words and quiet action as between shadow and substance:

P 25: I do not think this requires much explanation except what is called for from the fact that the address on the back of the card was in my handwriting. The fact is that workers used to come to my place sometimes for things which to me appeared to be not so serious or urgent as would justify the trouble, expense or waste of time that a journey from Chengail or Bauria to Calcutta entail, and which sometimes proved fruitless if I was not at home. So I kept always with me at home or when I would visit Bauria or Chengail a number of cards with my address written which I would give to those from whom I wanted some information or who wanted to tell me something but could not lest I should miss the train, asking them either to communicate to me in writing or fix up an appointment first if the matter was such as could not be put within the space of the card.

D/ 6.8 31.

I must have given one such card to Mr. Huda for my address - though I do not remember whether I gave it to him at Bauria or at my place. Mr. Huda must have written this in his own brief style in acceptance of my note inviting him to address some meetings at Bauria which I used to send, as I have already said, to the Trade Unionists or those who took an interest in Labour. In this connection I cannot help remarking that even on a short acquaintance I was very much struck with Mr. Huda's straightforward conduct. As I have already mentioned that it was at a Worker's meeting at Bauria that he was first introduced to me and I introduced him to the meeting exactly in terms in which he was introduced to me. He attended one or two meetings after that and also saw me once or twice at home. I did not know that he had any connection with the W.P.P. and I thought that the services of a young and energetic man like him, if available for Bauria, would be greatly helpful - particularly at that juncture, that is in November. I asked him whether he would be able to devote himself to Bauria Jute Worker's Union. It was then that he said that he differed from me in his political views and that his ideas regarding a union were not on all fours with mine and in the circumstances he did not think it would be possible for him to work regularly in and for the union in any definite official capacity, though during the strike he would try to attend as many meetings as possible and help, as much as he could, the Union for the success of the strike. As far as he was concerned he

scrupulously kept his word- attended some meetings when he could in response to my invitation, and kept clear, as far as I could see, from all underhand tricks or propaganda against the Bauria Jute Worker's Union, though I was informed he was engaged in the organisation of the Transport—Workers under the auspices of the Bengal Workers' and Peasants' Party.

P. 27:— I have already explained that P. 27 is a reply both to P. 526 (9) and P. 526 (7). The second paragraph relates to that unhappy misunderstanding between Mr. R.R. Mitra and myself over the sending of that cable to Mr. Saklatwala over the joint names of himself and Spratt. When I learnt about this for the first time from a casual mention of it by Spratt I pointed out to him that this was in violation of the resolution passed at Cawnpore. From Spratt's conversation I gathered that he was under the impression that the telegram was being sent with my knowledge I do not exactly remember the details but the version which Mr. Bankim Mukerjee gave seemed to differ on certain points from what Spratt told me and so I wrote to Spratt. I do not exactly remember as to how "the matter was settled after a prolonged discussion" or whether I was told about it all. Those were very busy times for me and somehow or other though I had tried I could never see Spratt and Mr. Mitra in any place where I could have a talk over it. I seldom if ever during the period between November and March 20th met Mr. Mitra alone or had any opportunity of having any talk with him on this matter.

P. 83 is also in connection with what I may call the Saklatwala cable and was written by Mr. R.R. Mitra in reply to a note by Spratt making an appointment at my place where we three would discuss the whole matter. As I have said, that meeting never took place, this reply was shown by Spratt to me and must have been left at my place and preserved by the typist who used to work for me and arrange my papers.

P. 41 is a Diary containing certain entries on certain dates of 1928. I do not know what is there to explain except that certain small payments made to or expenses incurred on behalf of Messrs. Mitra, Spratt and Huda in connection with journey to Bauria were noted there. The letter dates 6.4.28 written to Dr. Bishwanath Mukerjee which was recovered from his search, was put in as an exhibit P. 1428 by the Prosecution at the Inquiry Court, was dropped in this court and restored by me. That letter explains itself as regards the character of my relations with Dr. Bishwanath Mukerjee. I may say that this was the second letter I addressed to him, and, as I apprehended, met with the same fate as its predecessor, that is it was not replied to. That

did not encourage me to inflict on him a third letter and I had never any occasion to meet him since I first came in touch with him at Cawnpore till the 23rd of March 1929 when I found him safely lodged in a cell very close to the one selected for me in Meerut Jail.

The 'Vidayartha' mentioned on the same date to whom I also addressed a letter was that gentleman--the editor of the 'Partap', acclaimed today by both the Hindus and Muslims as a martyr to the cause of Hindu-Muslim Unity--who offered himself as a victim to the communal fury of some Muslim fanatics in the very attempt to save some of their own co-religionists from the attacks of some Hindu fanatics during the recent disgraceful communal riot at Cawnpore. He was the Chairman of the Reception Committee of the A.I.T.U.C. at Cawnpore, 1927 and the little contact that I was privileged to have with him for the few days I stayed at Cawnpore in connection with the Congress attracted me towards him for the unostentatious efficiency and charming courtsey and consideration with which he discharged his onerous duty. Now, this hospitable gentleman invited the Trade Unionist Delegates to tea at the 'Partap' office where the thinness of the attendance was due to the fact that many of the delegates had either left or were leaving that very day and had his guests grouped together for a photograph. A copy of this, I find, has been recovered from Mr. Dharni Goswami's search and has been put in as P. 10. I tried subsequently to secure a copy and wrote to Mr. Vidayartha for the same. I wrote to him twice and I believe that the latter ^{letter} I wrote to him was the one mentioned here. I did not get the copy of the photograph nor any reply. P. 694 is a hand bill printed for distribution amongst the Bauria workers issued by the Secretary of the B. T. U. F. containing the notice of a meeting to be held at Bauria on 8.7.28. The name of Mr. Kalidas Bhattacharji amongst the speakers indicates that far from ignoring Mr. Bhattacharji's position as one connected with the oldest union in the Jute industry affiliated to the Trade Union Congress, efforts were made by me to enlist his support. As a matter of fact even at a later stage, when his attitude was unmistakably hostile, invitation letters requesting him to address the meetings continued to be sent to him and his name sometimes was given as one of the speakers, though he seldom cared to attend the meetings.

P. 696 is a letter which, as I have already pointed out in connection with Chengail, did not reach me. I have nothing to add to what I have already said in that connection.

P. 526 (7):--I do not find this requires any further explanation than what I have already stated with regard to the "word" now.

Mr. Johnstone did never put up with me, though he called on me a number of times during his stay in Calcutta. The witness from Continental Hotel has deposed that Mr. Johnstone was staying there. I have already referred to P. 526 (9) in connection with P. 27 which I pointed out was a reply both to P. 526 (7) and P. 525 (9). Regarding the appeal sent to Mr. Saklatwala by Messrs. R. R. Mitra and Spratt enough has been said and nothing relevant remains to be said. Just a few words about the reference to Mr. Gopendra Chakravarty. By my subsequent experience gathered in the forced intimacy of the life in prison, I had absolutely no occasion to revise my opinion about him formed on a very limited acquaintance. But the passages preceding my opinion in this letter about him describe the modus operandi of the B. J. W. A., they—I am not referring to personalities, for less to Mr. Chakravarty whose good opinion I have learnt to value, but generally speaking they, that is the leaders of the B. J. W. A. "loved to do good by stealth" but I cannot say whether they "blushed to find it fame." When invited to attend meetings even at most critical times they would hardly come; in reply to letters asking for their assistance as I did, they would reply in the most approved bureaucratic style that "the matter was under consideration," but they would just quietly go, put up with some of the workers, who would naturally welcome them, and would collect a dozen or so of the workers and talk to them. I believe this is what is known as creating "fractions". Perhaps they were loyally following the tactics of their Party and it is not for me from this place to criticise these tactics. But I have learnt, as I have already pointed out, from my experience at Bauria that these tactics led nowhere but to disruption and during a strike to the defeat of the workers.

P. 526 (15) has already been dealt with in connection with Chengail strike.

P-526(13):—I have already explained this letter except on one point, namely reference to Chengail, "how could you appear as a meteor on the Chengail scene when the situation was such as to require your presence" ? This must have reference to the second strike, that is, women's strike at Chengail (according to Mr. R. R. Mitra in P. 119 the third strike which as I have explained before includes the March, strike with which the Federation had nothing to do.) and must have been written a few days later than the letter which was sent to the 'Statesman' for publication, because in P 118 I find that the strike broke out on the 4th June (though I myself do not remember the date), and I must have written the letter after I came to know of the Chengail strike.

I was indeed glad, in view of the nature of the assistance kindly referred by Spratt during the first strike (unlike the others who belong to his Party), to learn that he had come back—from Asansol, if I remember aright. But Spratt could not render much assistance during this second strike because, I suppose, of his pre-occupation with Lillooah and other matters.

I want to add another instance of C. I. D. curiosity and perverseness to what I said before in connection with the latter part of the letter. This instance I also came across in the late Mr. Montague's Diary. Mr. Montague refers to a conversation he had with Mr. C. F. Andrews (afterwards twice the President of the A. I. T. U. C.) who was very angry with Mr. Cleveland—the then Director of Criminal Intelligence Bureau—for interfering with his mail.

P. 593 dated 26. 7. 28 is an issue of Ganavani where I am attacked for creating what Mr. Muzaffar Ahmad, the editor, considered to be a number of small and overlapping unions, in spite of the Congress resolution, as he interpreted it, to the contrary. I do not consider this requires any further explanation than what I have already given in discussing my relations with the W. P. P.

P. 555:—I have already referred to it in connection with the controversy about Girni Kamgar contribution and I do not think any further observation is called for than this that I had nothing to do with the help that might have been given by the Dundee Jute Workers' Union with which Mr. Kalidas Bhattacharji was in direct communication. It may be noted that on one occasion that is, in P 24 I was writing to Mr. Joshi that "your wire to Dundee Jute Workers' Union might elicit some facts which might throw some light on the mystery (i. e. of the source from which Mr. Kalidas Bhattacharji received money out of which he paid Rs250/- to the Secretary Bauria Jute Workers' Union, which fact came accidentally to my notice through Mr. Gopendra Chakravarty."

P. 24: is the letter addressed by me to Mr. N. M. Joshi dated 7th December 1928. It has already been referred to by me several times and has been mentioned rather prominently by the learned Magistrate who quotes an extract from it only to misinterpret it, without the least reference to the context. I refer to the third paragraph of the letter in which I am telling Mr. Joshi about the principles of the Bengal Workers' and Peasants' Party. The date of the letter, as I have said is 7th December 1928 that is at a time when the Bauria jute workers were passing through a crisis and when the disruptive activities of the Workers' and Peasants' Party carried on through the Bengal Jute Workers' Association

were being felt most. Of course the Prosecution and therefore the learned Magistrate conveniently forgot that a man in his public capacity writing about the principles of any party in these terms could not possibly join in any of their conferences or demonstrations within a fortnight or so of the writing of that letter. The Prosecution and the learned Magistrate also seemed to have conveniently ignored the fact that the letter was being addressed to Mr. N. M. Joshi, the General Secretary, by the Secretary of a Provincial Committee. The Prosecution and the learned Magistrate also chose to ignore the little passage in Page 9 of this exhibit viz "I trust in the Congress (that is at the Jharia Congress) our supporters would muster strong." The Prosecution and the learned Magistrate again did not consider it worth while to take into account the passages which throw considerable light on the attitude of the Bengal Jute Workers' Association towards the Federation. Conveniently ignoring all these materials the learned Magistrate followed the Prosecution in coming to the conclusion that my criticism of the members of the Party is merely of character and efficiency and not of policy. Perhaps the learned Magistrate expected the Provincial Secretary to write not a letter but a thesis on Communist principles and tactics with a footnote in bold characters signifying for the benefit of the Police, Prosecution and the learned Magistrate that the writer did not approve of these principles and tactics. Perhaps it did not strike the learned Magistrate that Mr. N. M. Joshi did not require my views on Communists or Communism or what they stand for but rather on the activities that a particular party was pursuing as far as those activities affected the Federation or the union affiliated to or being organised by the Federation that is the Provincial Committee of A. I. T. U. C. The learned Junior Public Prosecutor laid great stress on my use of the words "so called" in connection with certain criticisms of the Workers' and Peasants' Party, thereby very ingeniously suggesting that I was conspiring against his Majesty with the genuine brand. Of course the little requirements of the Evidence Act are beside the point far less the requirements for the fair construction of a document. The suggestion is there and in weighing the balance of probability it seems to be safe in a political case to proceed on the assumption that an accused person is guilty.

I have already made it clear that far from having any objection to working with the Communists, up to the point where both Trade Unionists and the Communists can have a common platform while agreeing to differ on other matters, I invited their help in making the Bauria Strike a success, in the same way as Mr. K. C. Mitra invited them in connection with the Lillooah Strike, and I may also say in the same way as they who were conducting

the Scavengers' Strike invited the Bengal Trade Union Federation to help them to come to an honourable settlement with the Corporation. I did not write to the Workers' and Peasants' Party as such any formal letter of invitation because I considered it to be essentially a political party just as I did not address any formal letter of invitation to the Bengal Provincial Congress Committee. But I did write to the Secretary of the Bengal Jute Workers' Association a formal letter requesting it to help the workers of Bauria. The General Secretary of the Association wrote to me a three-line letter informing me curtly that my request was under consideration. But the result of that "consideration" was never communicated to me. I had invited several times Mr. Muzaffar Ahmad by letter to address meetings at Bauria, particularly after Mr. Muzaffar Ahmad had begun taking active part in the organisation of the Scavengers' Union. As I have stated before my study and experience about the Labour Movement in India convinced me that at the present stage of the Trade Union Movement of our country the best course to follow is to seek to find the greatest common measure of agreement amongst the various schools of thought in the working class movement, and in a strike particularly all the different parties and sections should unite in making the strike a success in the sense of getting for the workers as many concessions as was possible and practicable under the circumstances. I would no more treat those who in political parlance are called loyalists as untouchables than those who proclaim themselves to be Communists. I would, as I did and I had the support of the Bengal Trade Union Federation in what I did, condemn a loyalist not because he is a loyalist but for being disloyal to the Trade Union Movement to which he professes his allegiance, either by disobeying the resolution of the Trade Union Congress or by taking part in activities which are nothing short of strike-breaking activities so universally condemned by sincere Trade Unionists all over the world. Similarly if I had attacked the Communists it is not because of their views because each person is entitled to his views and I had no concern with those views unless and until those views are acted upon in a way which would affect the movement with which I am associated in an adverse way. I attacked the Communists because of their failure to act up to their professions and not only that but for acting in a way which is inconsistent with their professions, and my attack was based on facts within my personal knowledge. Their attitude appeared to me like that of a political party which proceeds on the assumption that if the country is to attain its salvation it must be through that particular party, otherwise let the country be damned. Put "working class" for "country" and you have the tactics in a nutshell as I saw them. Whatever may be their motives which

prompted them to act in the way they did during the Bauria Strike—and I am ready to concede that they were guided by the highest considerations from their standpoint—their activities took the shape of intrigues for party purposes, and, I hope that they did not realise it, tended to produce the same result as did the activities of some loyalists mentioned before, namely the collapse of the Strike. Never was the truth of the adage that extremes meet so vividly illustrated as at Bauria.

While I repudiate the suggestion of the Prosecution that I was conspiring with the genuine Communists while attacking their imitations as absolutely false and absurd on the face of it, I have never denied that I was ready to work in cooperation with Communists up to the point of common contact whose sincerity of conviction was demonstrated by something more tangible than the parrotlike repetition of big and high-sounding phrases coined by the makers of history, without reference to their application to the realities of life. In doing this I was loyally carrying out the policy of the All India Trade Union Congress which was neither a loyalist organisation, though there were loyalists in it, nor a Communist organisation, though there were Communists in it—so called or otherwise.

P 34:—It is a document without signature or any covering letter, purporting to be the typed copy of a report of the annual General Meeting of the Central Executive Council of the Bengal Jute Workers Association alleged to be held at Bhatpara on the 3rd January 1929. The cover in which the letter was addressed bears the posting date of 23rd January 1929 so it took about three weeks for those who sent the so-called report of the proceedings to decide as to whether it should be sent at all to the Secretary of the Bengal Trade Union Federation. The report was interesting for more than one reason. Overnight it seemed that the Bengal Jute Workers' Association grew into a very strong and very powerful union with branches spreading over to practically all the important Jute centres. Mr. Radha Raman Mitra was appointed the General Secretary, while Mr. Bankim Mukerji was made the Branch Secretary of Bauria; Mr. Hemanta Kumar Bose, a very able and hard-working Secretary of the North Calcutta Congress Committee was made an Assistant to Mr. Radha Raman Mitra. The Head Office was transferred to 97, Cornwallis Street. Such trifling details as that two unions were functioning at Chengail and Bauria of course were not allowed to interfere with the annexation policy of the Bengal Jute Workers' Association. I have already compared the policy pursued by this union to the selfish White Australian Policy. I am extremely sorry but in going through this document I was reminded of the practice of the Imperialist Powers in the 18th and

19th centuries of claiming hundreds and thousands of square miles of territory simply by virtue of the fact that one of their captains and discoverers had planted a flag on the fringe of the coast line of a country or continent inhabited by primitive tribes. Subsequently the International jurists were driven to discover a principle or formula to clothe these absurd claims with the appearance of rationality. I need not go into the different suggestions made and discussed only to be rejected, but if I remember aright ultimately a theory of "effective control" was accepted as a way out of the difficulty. It means in short that the area over which the claimant power would be able to exercise effective control would be taken as being covered by its flag. "Effective control" of Bengal Jute Workers' Association over the unions at Chengail and Bauria was nil. The fact that the Secretaries of both had sided with the Bengal Jute Workers' Association no more entitled the Bengal Jute Workers' Association to annex these two unions so unceremoniously, than that the Afghan Government can be entitled to proclaim India as a subordinate branch of the Afghan Administration because, to take an absurd illustration to explain the nature of an absurd claim, one or two of the members of the Viceroy's Executive Council had secret dealings with the Afghan Government. Inquiries disclose that there was not even a meeting held either at Chengail or Bauria to announce the glad tidings to the workers—of course I can not expect that the Bengal Jute Workers' Association should concede to the existing unions their right of self determination, and insist on the Federation convening a meeting of these unions and in the presence of both the parties ascertain their desires.

I decided to ignore these communications and went on as I was doing with the cases of the Bauria workers and trying to help as much as I could the families of those who had gone to prison. As a matter of fact I had suggested to Mr. Muzaffar Ahmad that some out of the Girni Kamgar money should be set apart for the relief of the families of those who had gone to the prison. This suggestion was ignored. However I was not very much perturbed by this communication at all, that is P 34. What I was concerned with at the time was to stem the tide of demoralisation that is bound to set in amongst the workers after the collapse of a strike in the same way that it does amongst a nation defeated in war. I was sure that the Federation as well as the All India Trade Union Congress would never allow this highhandedness of the Bengal Jute Workers' Association to go unchallenged. I was besides collecting materials for the final report for the All India Trade Union Congress in which I intended to expose the tactics pursued by some loyalists as well as by the Bengal Jute Workers' Association backed up by the Workers' and Peasants' Party. It may be remembered that the

preliminary report D 285 (2) was already submitted to Mr. N. M. Joshi.

Lillooah Strike.

In support of my assertion that the Prosecution for their own purpose, have given credit where none was due, and that they have distorted facts to suit their theory instead of basing their conclusion on proved facts, I have already cited the instance of Lillooah Strike which the Prosecution suggests was controlled by the Workers' and Peasants' Party and that I helped the Party in what to the Prosecution must appear as its nefarious designs. The learned Magistrate, as usual, accepted the Prosecution theory in its entirety notwithstanding certain glaring facts which knocked the bottom out of this theory. P. 2419 for example, which the learned Magistrate wrongly cites more than once in support of what is imagined to be a question of Bauria Jute workers affiliation to the Bengal Trade Union Federation against the wishes of the Workers' and Peasants' Party, could have, if he were inclined to seek light, thrown considerable light on the relations between the Workers' and Peasants' Party and the E. I. Ry. Union at Lillooah conducting the strike under the leadership of Mr. K. C. Mitra. P 2419: as I have already pointed out, is a photographic copy of a letter dated 23rd October 1928 alleged to have been written by Spratt to one "Dear Robin", wherein the writer with admirable candour describes the attitude of the Workers' and Peasants' Party of Bengal to the various strikes conducted under what he thinks to be "reactionary" leadership. "I am afraid", says the writer, "we rather made fools of ourselves over the Lillooah Strike. We merely gave some assistance in agitation etc, but without making any serious difference to the ill-judged and very reactionary policy of Mitra". Then he in fairness admits that Mitra was forced to call off the strike against his will and concludes that "Mitra made clever use of the situation and succeeded in fooling us pretty completely, while we have little in the way of propaganda achieved to compensate for it".

D/ 7. 8. 31.

I may mention here that Mr. K. C. Mitra before calling off the strike sought advice from Mr. Subhas Chandra Bose, the President of the Bengal Provincial Congress Committee, Mr. Mrinal Kanti Bose, the President of the Bengal Trade Union Federation and my humble self as the Secretary of the B. T. U. F. and was guided by the advice given to him with due regard to the circumstances at the time.

But besides this letter there were other indications to prove the relations subsisting between the Workers' and Peasants' Party

and Mr. K. C. Mitra, the leader of the Lillooah strike. These indications were as usual ignored by the Prosecution who have throughout the case displayed a wonderful capacity for brushing aside all awkward facts which are likely to be detrimental to their pet theory, namely, that the strikes were being engineered or exploited by the Workers' and Peasants' Party in the furtherance of conspiracy and that as far as Bengal was concerned I was helping this Party with right good will. A number of issues of the "Ganavani" published towards the end of the strike or subsequent to its being called off would show to every one having eyes to see how Mr. Mitra was being to quote a favourite Communist phrase, "ruthlessly exposed."

Before I come to deal with my connection with this strike I want to invite the attention of the Court to two very important facts, namely, that Mr. Mitra from the beginning to end as the General Secretary of the E. I. R. Union-affiliated to the A. I. T. U. C. — was leading the strike, forced on him by the unbending attitude of the agent who had declared a lock-out, and secondly that Mr. Mitra did not allow himself to be dictated to by the Workers' and Peasants' Party in the conduct of the strike though he might have sought their help and, I am almost disposed to be envious, was more fortunate in receiving their help as well as abuse than my humble self who received the abuse without the help in regard to Bauria. That the leader of the strike throughout was Mr. K. C. Mitra has been admitted by P. W. 94. That the strike was due to the refusal of the agent to concede to certain legitimate demands of the workers has not been denied even by the Prosecution. I have already said enough to show the attitude of the Workers' and Peasants' Party towards Mr. K. C. Mitra and pointed out what their views were in regard to the conduct of the strike.

Regarding my humble share in it, the learned Magistrate, while disposed to find "nothing strange" for the Secretary of the B. T. U. F. in attending "such strikes and meetings" considered it to be his duty to bring out that "he (myself) did not attend any of the strike meetings at Lillooah until the W. P. P. had taken up the strike more than three months after its inception, (P. W. 230)."

Now, Sir, when I read this I was somewhat curious to ascertain the facts on which the learned Magistrate based his conclusion that I did not attend any of the strike meetings at Lillooah until the W. P. P. had taken up the strike more than three months after its inception. But I found that the learned Magistrate has committed the same mistake that he did in regard to P. 2419, that is, he has given a reference which does not at all support his conclusion. P. W. 230 referred to by the learned Magistrate is Inspector

J. M. Chatterji, D. I. B., Howrah, whose number in this court is P. W. 94. Now this witness stated before the Magistrate that the Lillooah strike started on the 5th March 1928. He identified S. N. Banerji, Spratt, Gopendra Chakravarty, R. R. Mitra, Muzaffar Ahmad and myself who, he said, were occasionally present at the meetings of the Lillooah workers and sometimes spoke at them. "The first meeting", I am now quoting his very words, "when any of them was noticed was March 16th, when Spratt was present at a meeting on Howrah Maidan; he made a short speech". Then he goes on deposing to several meetings at none of which he mentions me till he comes to 28th May when he has stated that I was present at Lillooah Maidan. This is substantially what the witness repeated in this Court also, except on one point where he improved on his statement in the Lower Court. In the Lower Court he said that Spratt, S. N. Banerji and others already mentioned "were occasionally present at the meetings of the Lillooah workers and sometimes spoke at them". In this court perhaps it being found that this sort of statement would not do, he alters it and says, "I saw these men during that strike in March and later.....they spoke in some of these meetings." But neither in this Court nor in the Lower Court does he specifically mention me till he comes to the meeting of the 28th May. But, in whatever way one may take it, one finds no support in this witness for the learned Magistrate's conclusion that I came into the Lillooah picture with the W. P. P. who took up the strike three months later than its inception.

But what are the facts about me? The facts were before the learned Magistrate, embodied in the proceedings of the B.T.U.F. which is marked P. 26. On page 34 we find an emergent meeting held on the 21st April in which a letter from Mr. K. C. Mitra addressed to the Secretary of the Federation inviting this boy's help for the strike was read out and the following resolution was passed:—

Resolution No. 3. Read a letter addressed to Mr. Kishori Lal Ghosh, Secretary, Provincial Committee of the All-India Trade Union Congress by Mr. K. C. Mitra, Secretary of E. I. R. Indian Labour Union and be it resolved that a Committee be formed, with powers to co-opt, with the following gentlemen representing all sections of public and members of the Federation to take charge of propaganda, of raising fund and of administering relief to the needy locked-out Railway workers and factory workers of Berne, Jessop and Martin on strike:—

- (1) Mr. Subhas Chandra Bose, M. L. C.—President.
- (2) „ Mrinal Kanti Bose, Vice-President.

- (3) Mr. M. Daud, Vice-President.
- (4) Sjt. J. Chowdhury.
- (5) „ Prahbudayal Himmat Singh.
- (6) Maulana Abul Kalam Azad.
- (7) Mr. Wahid Hussain.
- (8) Sjt. Satyananda Bose.
- (9) Sjt. A. N. Bose.
- (10) Mr. Muzaffar Ahmad.
- (11) Mr. Latafat Hussain.
- (12) Mr. Kalidas Bhattacharji.
- (13) Mr. Muzamil Ali.
- (14) Mr. Ramanand Chatterji—Treasurer.
- (15) Mr. Kishori Lal Ghosh, Secretary.
- (16) Sjt. J. Gangauli, Asstt: Secretary.
- (17) Mr. Chandrama Dhab Ghosh, Asstt: Secretary.
- and* (18) Mr. Abdul Haq, the mover of the resolution.

The letter read in the meeting was copied by me and incorporated in the proceedings. The original letter has also been recovered from my search and has been put in by me as Defence exhibit no: 207 (9). This letter clearly explains my presence in the Lillooah meetings and the part—small as it was—I was privileged to play in that strike. But it is rather curious to note that in the printed exhibits this part of the proceedings is altogether left out while a part of the proceedings of this same meeting is printed—I refer to the part relating to May Day—in a way which is likely to mislead those who would not care to go through the original, as I have already pointed out to your Honour while dealing with May Day celebration. Now, Sir, this part of the proceedings, if I may be permitted to state, is extremely relevant as showing how I came to be in the Lillooah strike. The duty of the Prosecution, as I understand it with my not too extensive knowledge of law, is to help the Court in arriving at the truth. I certainly do not expect the Prosecution to supply materials for defence, but I do expect, and as far as I know the law, the law requires that all available materials helpful for ascertaining the truth should be placed before the Court. In this instance, as in many other instances, I have pointed out before, the Prosecution have failed in their duty. They have left out of the agenda, the item regarding the Lillooah strike. They have left out that part of the proceedings recording the resolution in which Mr. K. C. Mitra's letter is referred to and giving an account of the highly representative committee which was formed and in pursuance of

which I arranged the series of meetings which have been deposed to against me. I do not know whether it is too much to expect that the learned Magistrate should have looked through the original exhibits in this case.

But, Sir, I confess that I was simple enough not only to expect this much but to expect more. In concluding my statement before the learned Magistrate I had the presumption of referring him to my Trade Union files which were amongst the articles recovered from my search but not exhibited by the Prosecution. Not that the learned Magistrate did not refer to any unexhibited document, I must do him the justice to say that he did refer to some as would be evident from the case of Mr. M. G. Desai (see page 268 of the Committal Order), but he did this to justify some inference against him—perhaps his reading of the law prevented him from drawing inferences in favour of the accused from evidence before him or in his control or custody. At any rate I have produced in this court some correspondence between myself and Mr. N. M. Joshi and copies of certain letters which Mr. Joshi addressed to Mr. K. C. Mitra and sent to me for information—all out of my Trade Union files seized from my possession during search. What do these letters indicate? They indicate that since the “inception” of the Lillooah strike I was in correspondence with the General Secretary of the A. I. T. U. C., sending him official reports on the situation there and that he was giving instructions and advice to me as the Provincial Secretary what to do under given circumstances.

The General Secretary was also keeping me informed of the substance of the correspondence that passed between him and Mr. K. C. Mitra and in response to the latter's appeal for help directed him to approach Mr. C. F. Andrews, the President of the A. I. T. U. C at the time in Calcutta, Mr. V. V. Giri, the President of the B. N. R. Indian Labour Union and myself, the Secretary of the Provincial Committee (D. 208 (16)). As regards my efforts for an honourable settlement there is also before the Court D 207 (11) which is a letter addressed by me to the Agent, E. I. R. informing him that a committee had been appointed at a public meeting presided over by Mr. Subhas Chandra Bose at Beadon Square on the 26th April with Mr. C. F. Andrews at the head to discuss with him the terms proposed by Mr. C. F. Andrews at a meeting held on the 25th April at Wellington Square. D. 207 (4) is the reply of the Agent turning down the proposal. All this mass of evidence was lying under the control and custody of the learned Magistrate—at any rate he had the proceedings of the B. T. U. F. before him, which if he had cared to use, would have

saved him from the confusion that led him to conclude that I did not take part in the Lillooah strike until the W. P. P. had taken it up, more than three months after its inception. The witness relied upon, as I have shown, does not bear him out, whereas there was sufficient explanation, as I just pointed out, of my participation in the Lillooah strike. In this connection I refer the Court to D 208 (13), D. 208 (14), D. 208 (17), D 208 (16) amongst others.

Briefly put it amounts to this that I helped the Lillooah strike under the direction of the B. T. U. F. with the approval of the General Secretary, A. I. T. U. C., on the invitation of Mr. K. C. Mitra who was leading the strike. My activities were confined to rousing public sympathy for the strikers and helping Mr. K. C. Mitra in all possible ways to arrive at an honourable settlement with the Agent. In all this I was having the full support of the President of the A. I. T. U. C. of the President of the Federation, of the President of the Bengal Provincial Congress Committee, of Mr. J. M. Sen Gupta, then leader of the Congress Party in the Bengal Council, of Dr. P. C. Roy, Mr. Ramanand Chatterji and many other public men well-known in Bengal. I do not know how or where the W. P. P. came in as far as my participation in the Lillooah strike was concerned.

This brings me to the speeches I delivered at meetings organised by me as the Secretary of the B. T. U. F. in connection with the Lillooah strike. These are P. 1893 (1) (3), P. 2264 and P 2265. These are the only speeches the so-called full texts of which are before the Court. Since December, 1925 when I was elected Secretary, Press Employees' Association, and thus began to take an active part in the Trade Union Movement, up to the time of my arrest in March 1929 I had delivered something like four hundred speeches at public meetings—mostly workers' meetings, not a few political, and a few dealing with social problems. In about 90% of these meetings I found the C. I. D. reporters occupying the best place—better in many cases than Press reporters could secure. About 80% of these speeches were delivered in Bengali. The Prosecution have put in only four speeches. Of these again it appears that the necessity for transcribing P. 1893 (1) and P 2264 (1) did not occur to anyone earlier than 20th May, 1929, and 19th May, 1929, that is about two months after my arrest.

P. 2265 bears no date of transcription.

P. 1893 (3) only was transcribed on 2nd May 1928, that is within a week of its delivery.

So excepting in the case of P. 1893 (3) I may take it that the three other speeches put in were transcribed as an after-thought after the case was instituted and when the hunt for evidence was going on in full swing.

In a political case like this in which the public utterances of an accused, his published or unpublished writings, and even the books and literature in his possession have been scanned and scrutinised with a view to make out that his intention was such as to have tended to bring his activities, though lawful in themselves, within the mischief of section 121 A, it is rather surprising that the efforts of the Police and Prosecution would be rewarded with such poor results. Not only this. The learned Magistrate, following the cue of the learned Junior Public Prosecutor whose summing up at the Inquiry Court, as far as my case was concerned, might have entitled him to a prize in case for a competition for abuse, has added insult to injury by the incorporation of some of the suggestions made and of some of the very terms used by Mr. J. P. Mitter of Cambridge holding the second brief on behalf of the Crown in this case.

After summarising in essence my defence as far as he could gather from the statement I made before him, the learned Magistrate observes that "the difficulty is that there is so little to throw light on the real motives for his (my) actions and some of what there is is so contradictory." Then again the learned Magistrate remarks:—"Often in this case the published views of an accused, or his public speeches, have been used to show this connection. In Kishori Lal's case, several speeches are on the record but do not elucidate the question. He speaks throughout as a trade unionist concerned only with the immediate issues. He specially says so on one occasion: "It is to remove these ordinary human wants that we have to-day gone on strike and if this humble purpose is fulfilled, it will be enough for us, (P. 1893 (3)). And he goes on say that it is evolution which is wanted, not revolution, though he hints that if demands are not granted, it might turn out to be revolution. This is unlike the frank utterances of party members. In some other speeches he defends the use of "Moscow gold", and praises the R.I. L. U. which sent money without asking, as compared with the I. F. T. U. which sent grudgingly though asked (P. 2264). But these are only hints of leanings towards Moscow."

To add to his difficulties he finds no writing of mine which might give him some idea about my views. "His only literary efforts", says the learned Magistrate regretfully, "was an appeal to the workers of Jamshedpur". He finds this circular to

be of interest only for its language which contains the well-known slogan "Workers of the world unite" and speaks of "solidarity and so on". The learned Magistrate found this as "significant".

I make no apology in quoting the learned Magistrate in extenso because of the importance of speeches and writings in this case as an indication of the views of the accused, which are perhaps the only data on which a finding has to be come to as to agreement and intention so essential to bring home to an accused the charge of conspiracy. In this case there being no overt illegal act, each and every act of the accused being legal and lawful, speeches and writings have got to be looked into,—if need be with the aid of a magnifying glass or microscope—so that at least a colourable case may be made out. I can well realise the difficulty of the Prosecution as reflected in the Committal Order which I have taken throughout as a convenient summary of the Prosecution case. I can also understand how the difficulty has been sought to be got over and the weakness of the Prosecution case covered by the use of such unjudicial and not very elegant terms as "flirt" and the suggestion of absence of frankness. With regard to this charge of absence of frankness there seems throughout to be a suggestion, namely, that "here was a man who entered into the conspiracy, but has taken care to throw dust into the eyes of the Police, Prosecution and Inquiry Magistrate. He has the impudence to say things which are apparently innocent and write very little thus making it difficult for the Prosecution to ascertain the motives of his activities. The other conspirators are good fellows, at any rate they are frank, and so facilitate the Prosecution task, but the Prosecution is certainly not to be deceived by appearances but will teach the man a lesson."

Last it should be thought that I am putting a fanciful interpretation on the observation of the learned Magistrate, I should like to quote another passage. On page 11 after allowing the Communists and genuine Trade Unionists to work side by side in the formation of unions and conduct of strikes the learned Magistrate observes on page 12 :—"On the other hand if a man is proved to have joined the conspiracy his Trade Union activities may be taken as a corroboration of the other evidence relating to the conspiracy, even though he is careful enough in his published speeches and writings to avoid making his real objects too obvious."

The fallacy which is called "petitio principii" is apparent in the application of this principle to my case, because as the learned Magistrate himself states on page 11, "It is necessary to look to the surrounding circumstances and to the views expressed by him. Again, however, it must be said that the criterion must be whether

there is definite proof of joining this particular conspiracy or not." In practice however theories, presumptions and unwarranted inferences from the evidence led by the Prosecution have been allowed to supply the want of "definite proof".

The speeches put in as evidence against me may be divided into two classes: those claimed to be taken down verbatim by Bengali shorthand reporters employed by the Government and those which your Honour calls gist reports, that is speeches of which an alleged summary was made by Police officers belonging to the Intelligence Branch of the Bengal Police or Special Branch of the Calcutta Police. I contend and I propose to show that none of them is what it purports to be. The speeches are not verbatim reports of what I said whereas the gist reports are not what we usually understand by them. They are isolated passages strung together—and even then these passages verbatim reports of what I said—instead of being an intelligent and connected summary of what I said. Of course the witnesses who deposed to them could not be expected, for it would be as much as their job is worth, to admit that this was the case. But I propose to make good my point from the internal evidence, as well as from the depositions of Messrs. K. B. Roy P. W. 92 and Brailsford and from the admissions of Sub Inspector G. Roy P. W. 36.

The first point to be noted in regard to the so-called fully reported speeches is that most of them, as I have pointed out at the outset, were transcribed under orders after the case had begun—long after they were delivered. The second point is that there are certain asterisk marks denoting blanks in the transcription and in one or two speeches at least a note to the effect that the reporter being tired could not take down the full speech. The third point is the statement of Mr. K. B. Roy, who said he would not expect certain words in a prepared speech, by which he did not necessarily mean a written speech but one that was not 'extempore.' The fourth point is that the passage about Evolution and Revolution was pronounced to be unintelligible by Mr. Brailsford though the learned Magistrate did not evidently find any difficulty in making sense in his own way. It has been the misfortune of public men of this country to have their speeches reported by the agents of the Police in such a way as to put them in the worst possible light. By this I do not mean only that some touches here and there may be given to improve the Prosecution case but I also mean that the speeches as reported by these reporters are nothing but a caricature of the original, and the speaker himself seldom recognises his own speech. During the last Civil Disobedience Movement Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru and if I remember aright Mr. J. M. Sen Gupta complained against the inefficiency of police reporters. During the cross-examination of some

of these reporters in this Court I remember to have heard your Honour saying that the witness~~s~~ reported what he heard—the suggestion being that the speakers in the excitement of the moment said things in a way which now with the lapse of the time and in the calmer atmosphere of the Court seems to them of a quality which leaves much to be desired. I am not concerned with other accused who, I am sure would make their own position clear in this respect. But as far as I am concerned this was not the case. The speeches tendered against me were delivered by me, as I have already stated, in connection with the Lillooah Strike as Secretary of the B.T.U.F. at the series of meetings organised by me under the authority of the Federation at the request of Mr. K.C. Mitra for raising funds for the relief of the strikers and incidentally to give publicity to the grievances of the workers and carry on a propaganda on behalf of the Trade Union Movement. The programme of these meetings was drawn up and given wide publicity through the press and leaflets. I selected the theme I should deal with at each meeting beforehand. The ~~primary~~^{primary} subject I wanted to deal with was that the educated lower middle classes should make common cause with the workers in their uplift. There should be a combination of brain and muscles. The point I wanted to make may be thus summarised:— The manual workers ^{have} great stamina and energy, ^{and} are impulsive, while the intellectual workers have foresight, patience, prudence and perseverance. As long as at least there is no system of compulsory primary education, intellectual workers are bound to lead their comrades who live by their muscles, till there is complete fusion between the two sets of workers.

In view of the composition of these meetings which were attended mostly by the people of the lower middle class, I stressed the necessity of cooperation between the brain workers and the manual workers and urged on the former to come to the rescue of the latter when they have taken upon themselves the sufferings which a strike or lockout entails on the workers, for the improvement of their working conditions. But while dealing with the main thing I had to meet the baseless charges and insinuations made by the loyalists and Anglo Indian Press to damn the workers in the eyes of the public. So the speeches I delivered in connection with the relief for Lillooah workers in the meetings organised by the Federation were well thought out. I also sought to impress on the meetings that the fight for political freedom (which I believe appeals to every decent Indian who is not ashamed of having been born in this country) has no meaning unless it is also a fight for economic freedom, namely freedom from want and starvation. I told them that it is absurd to expect that the workers should participate in the struggle for making a country politically

free simply because in that struggle they have to fight only the English, but should do nothing to improve their own economic conditions, because in so doing they might have to fight the Indian Capitalists also who are their own countrymen. One passage conveying the idea has been so carelessly reported as to make it meaningless in reference to the context. I refer to P 2265—the last passage but one before the asterisks— Can you ever, about your struggle now proceeding, say to a coolie or a worker or to a man employed in a mill, that he will only fight for economic justice to himself and not fight for political justice? If you once infuse into him a sense of injustice, if you once rouse his manhood, he will never make any discrimination as to whose interest may be affected, he will find out the path of salvation." Here amongst other things the word "political" has been put in where I used the word "economic" and vice versa. "To himself" is not correct. The whole passage was meant to convey the idea that it was absurd to expect that the workers should be content with carrying out a political fight and do nothing in securing for themselves economic justice which to them is far more vital and affects them more closely and immediately. If the passages preceding this are taken into account it would be obvious that some sentences which formed the connecting links are missing, because the passage just now quoted by me was intended as a reply to an argument often advanced by Nationalists of a certain type namely that Indian industries being in their infancy can not afford to insure decent working conditions to the workers, however much the employers might be willing to do so. They contend that the Indian Capitalists are under a great handicap because of the political dependence of the country, and therefore all patriotic men should combine first of all to oust the foreigners from political power, instead of ruining the infant Indian industries by setting up workers' organisations with what they consider to be exorbitant demands. These are the very men, I may add, who would very much like to have the workers tagged on to the political movement on the assurance that every thing would come out alright when Swaraj is established. They would seek to establish watertight compartments labelled "political freedom" and "economic freedom" and would like the workers to help them force open the first door—as regards the second door, well, there is no hurry in seeking to open it. In other words for a nebulous Swaraj which on definition appears to be nothing more nor less than "Swaraj," the workers are asked to stake their little all but have to wait for their economic salvation indefinitely. They might indulge in a strike or two in concerns run purely by Europeans with European capital but they should think twice before

fighting a concern which is exclusively run by Europeans, but the capital is predominantly Indian as in the case of most of the jute mills. They should think thrice before fighting a concern where the capital is purely Indian, but the management is predominantly European as Jamshedpur Tata Iron Works. But 'mum' is the word where both the management and the capital are Indian. It is unpatriotic to say anything which would disturb the relations between the employers and the employed. The argument may seem to be absurd and illogical on the very face of it, but unfortunately this argument is often advanced and I have found that many educated people accept the argument and believe in it. In the case of the Lillooah workers, this argument was extended even to the E. I. R. as well, by the loyalists' press, because, it was said that, the railway, having recently come under the state management, is as such a national concern.

D/- 8. 8. 31.

High wages to workers would mean greater cost of production and the Lillooah and other workshops would fail to compete with imported articles because the Government will have to buy in the cheapest market and thus the industry would go to the wall. So to meet their arguments I had to show whether these concerns are run with due efficiency and consequent economy, besides among other things showing that human mind is incapable of being divided into water-tight compartments. If you fight for freedom, it must be freedom all round and it should not be interpreted as merely a fight for political power or loaves and fishes of office. In other words the struggle for freedom was not the replacing of an alien bureaucracy by a pukka Swadeshi bureaucracy. In saying this I was not saying anything new, but was simply repeating in my own way what was being said by the Trade Unionists all over India, and what was so ably said by the late C.R. Dass as the President of the Lahore Session of the All-India Trade Union Congress. I would have been false to the Trade Union Movement which claims my allegiance if I had missed any opportunity of exposing the absurdity of this contention of a section of the Nationalists. We, the Trade Unionists, claim to have brought the Indian National Congress over to our views based on reason, equity and justice by means of our reasoned criticism of the weakness of the programme of the National Congress in as much as it failed to incorporate workers' demands in their programme. The Karachi Session of Indian National Congress with its economic programme bears witness to the fact that the Congress is being slowly but steadily influenced by the persistent efforts of the Trade Unionists and is favourably reacting to the needs of the growing Labour Movement in this country.

There are various other instances which can be pointed out in support of my contention that the so-called verbatim reports are anything but verbatim. It is for example absurd that the Secretary of the Provincial Committee who was acting in close cooperation with and I may say under instructions from Mr. N. M. Joshi, the General Secretary of the A. I. T. U. C. as D. 208 (13), D 208 (14), D 208 (15), D 208 (16), and D 208 (17) show, should refer to Mr. Joshi in terms which border on the contemptuous (P 2264 (1) (2), page 33). Apart from the fact that Mr. Joshi was one of the very few nominated members, if not the only one amongst them, who had been able to command the respect of the Indian public in general and the working class public in particular, also apart from the fact that Spratt during a very short acquaintance with me was struck with what he says as my being inclined to be "statesman-like like Joshi", I submit that it is rather unusual for one holding the responsible position I did to refer to the General Secretary of the Central body in this way.

Then again in P 2264, page 29, 2nd paragraph, when I was pointing out the disproportionate remunerations paid by the Jute companies to the higher staff of the management which run the managing agencies and to the workers who had actually produced the stuff, the following passage has been attributed to me:— "We have calculated statistics and found that after paying so many big Sahibs, filling the stomachs of the Managers, the line Managers, Departmental Heads and all the Jamadars and Headclerks besides, each man gets Rs. 20/- per week—from this they get Rs. 20/- per man. Inclusive of all expenses—this means serious exploitation." The passage particularly the last portion of it, as it stands, is meaningless or if there is any meaning to be gathered it contradicts what I intended to say. "Each man gets Rs. 20/- per week—from this they get Rs. 20/- per man". But what I said was, what many Trade Unionists engaged in the organisation of Jute workers know and would say, that the average productive capacity per worker, after deducting the costs of management etc. etc., when put in terms of money, comes up to Rs. 20/- per week whereas he gets at an average Rs. 20/- per month, that is Rs. 5/- per week. (In this connection it may be noted that Messrs. Johnstone and Sime in their report called Exploitation in India (D 65), worked out the average wages per head at about Rs. 15/- per month.) But the passage immediately before the one now referred to may also be taken up to show not only that the reporter wanted to summarise but that in the process he made a mess of what I said. Now, as it would appear, my whole point was to show how the owners were profiting at the sole expense of the workers. I wanted to show that in spite of in-efficiency of management leading to dishonesty and corruption it was possible to declare huge dividends. Here I narrated one

incident within my personal knowledge to show that even when specific cases of corruption and bribery were brought to the notice of the managing Agents, they tried to hush up the whole thing rather than avail themselves of the facts to institute an enquiry and make the repetition of the same improbable by punishing those found guilty. This attitude of benevolence towards corruption they could afford to maintain, so I agreed, because notwithstanding all this the profits continued to be very large and because in the last resort it was the workers who were made to pay. The whole incident has been summarised and generalised as "besides these heavy profits there are illegitimate gains. From the Jamadar to the Bara Sahib all steal and thereby fill their stomachs." Brevity may be the soul of wit but reporters are expected to report and not summarise. The context moreover does not justify the lumping together of the "heavy profits" of the owners with the "illegitimate gains" of their employees.

The passage in which the learned Magistrate has found some hints of leaning towards Moscow have to be taken with due regard to what I intend to call charitably, imperfect reporting. As a matter of fact I was concerned to expose the "bluff" behind all this agitation against the receipt of Moscow money. My point was to show that by closing all the avenues through which the Indian might get at the truth about Russia and by constant propaganda against everything Russian a deep prejudice had been created in the minds of the people. And now to damn the workers on strike and alienate public sympathy from them, the telegram to Moscow which was not sent was being exploited for what it was worth. That this was the motive would further appear from P 2265 T, in which I again reverted to the subject at Sardhanand Park, three days after the speech (P 2264) delivered at Desh-Bandhu Park. On page 39 of P 2265 T it is stated "but this telegram to Moscow— which was not despatched, and yet about which for seven or eight days there was serious discussion and the contents of which before anybody else came to know, were published in the 'Statesman'—from this it can be further inferred that there is a serious mischievous intent in it. We know that some of our Nationalist leaders have been greatly upset by this. Men from whom very large sums may be expected for this relief work are, many of them, frightened by the name of Moscow. There are many benevolent men in our country from whom we can expect some money for Lillooah; on approaching them, we were told that they were very nervous about this Moscow telegram, no matter whether or not it was sent, about the mere mention of it. It is quite clear that those who are in this strike include some men who want to isolate the Lillooah workers. They want to show that they are in touch with Moscow, so that those here who

possess wealth and property, and want to do business should not help these men any way with money.

I referred to the British Trade Union Congress and the I. F. T. U. simply to show that they were approached by the President and the General Secretary of the A. I. T. U. C. for help through cable and it was only after it was found that help was not forthcoming that Mr. K. C. Mitra as the leader of the strike being pressed badly for money was compelled to send the cable to Moscow. My point was to justify the sending of the cable and not to denounce the British Trade Union Congress which was at the time officially connected with the A. I. T. U. C. of which I was a Provincial Secretary nor the I. F. T. U. because there was no occasion for it. I have already pointed out the circumstances which made it necessary for me that the speeches should be the result of some previous preparation and consequently the theme of my speech used to be previously selected by me.

In this connection I may point out that the learned Magistrate is incorrect when he said that "on one occasion," that is in P1893(3), I referred to the "humble purpose" that is the removal of the ordinary human wants of the workers. I referred to this on several occasions in the course of my speeches. Please see P 2265 (page 39) for the passage, "The point is we must have a minimum wage or something like it for which we struck work thus". As a matter of fact the trend of the speeches was to defend the workers and win public sympathy for them sought to be alienated by unscrupulous propaganda to the effect that it was not a genuine Trade dispute and that the whole thing, being engineered and financed by Moscow to bring about revolutionary conditions in India. On an occasion like this the denunciation of British Trade Union Congress or the I. F. T. U., even supposing that I was not very favourably disposed towards them, was not only irrelevant but also was likely to weaken the force of my contention.

But I must not be understood to mean, from what I have said just now that I deny that I made any reference to the R.I.L.U. or the British Trade Union Congress or the I.F.T.U. My point is that I did refer to them but not in the way I was reported to have done. I simply stated the facts as they came to my knowledge without any comment. I do not suggest that I would not have been justified in referring to the British Trade Union Congress (I do not say anything about the I.F.T.U. because

there was no occasion to refer to it) even in stronger language than I was reported to have done, considering the circumstances prevailing at the time. In view of the terrible sufferings of the locked out workers—the relentless attitude of the Agent who as D 207 (4) and D 207 (11) will show—even declined to discuss terms for an honourable settlement with such eminent men as Mr. C.F. Andrews, President of the A.I.T.U.C. and Mr. Subhas Chandra Bose, President of the Bengal Provincial Congress Committee—it was a shock to me to be informed by Mr. Joshi in a letter to Mr. K.C. Mitra, a copy of which was sent to me for information, that in reply to his cables for help Mr. Citrine, General Secretary of the British Trade Union Congress had, cabled to him that he would take up the matter with the India Office. It is extremely unfortunate that the Court did not see its way to summon the English witnesses cited by the Defence, but if Mr. Purcell and Hallsworth were summoned to the box they would have admitted that in their concluding farewell Address to the Executive Council of the T.U. Congress which held its sittings at Delhi in February 1928, they sought to impress on us the necessity of giving particular attention to the organisations of railway workers. A strong railway worker's Union with its branches spread all over the line or a successful Railway strike which from its very nature would cover a far greater area than any strike by the workers of any other industry, has, as Mr. Purcell pointed out, a great educative value to the workers in general belonging to that wide area. This was the essence of their argument in favour of devoting greater attention to the railway workers. It would of course be not in accordance with facts if I were to say that the Lillooah deadlock was the direct outcome of the parting advice of these fraternal delegates from the British Trade Union Congress. But I argued to myself that, in view of the fact that these fraternal delegates from the British Trade Union Congress, though they came at a time when the British Labour Party was in bad odour with the Indian public because of their participation in the Simon Commission which was condemned by all reputable sections of Indian opinion—were given the most cordial reception by the A.I.T.U.C. including the B.T.U.F. (D 270) and treated as close friends or relatives from whom we had nothing to hide, they must have gained a true idea of the Indian Trade Union Movement and as their Report shows they discharged their duties conscientiously. But when closely following in the sequence of time their visit and their farewell advice there was this deadlock in one of the big workshops of a big railway—one of the demands of the workers being the full recognition of the Union, the British Trade Union Congress was certainly expected to do something more substantial than a formal

deputation to the India Office presided over by a die-hard like the late Lord Birkenhead. But however legitimate might be the reasons for which I might have justifiably felt resentment against the British Trade Union Congress at what I considered the apathetic attitude of its General Council I could never allow myself to forget what I owed to the responsible position I occupied as the Secretary of the Provincial Committee of the A.I.T.U.C. which only a few months ago had appointed the British Trade Union Congress as its representative in Great Britain. And yet, to save the Lillooah workers from the unscrupulous propaganda started by the enemies of the workers in the press; I had to say something about the appeal that was sent to the R.I.L.U. by Messrs. K.C. Mitra, Spratt and Muzaffar Ahmad—an appeal about which I was not consulted and did not know till it was published in the papers—that never reached its destination but was made the pretext of a campaign of vilification and misrepresentation. In these circumstances all that I did was to narrate the facts as were within my knowledge without any comment. My object was not to damn the British Trade Union Congress far less the I.F.T.U. or to extol the R.I.L.U. at the expense of these two bodies of which as I have said one was officially connected with the A.I.T.U.C. I simply wanted to suggest that Mr. K.C. Mitra was driven by necessity to send an appeal to Moscow for help and that it is not at all a heinous crime as it is represented to be to accept help from the Russian workers, particularly during a critical phase of the deadlock when the workers were being pressed to the wall and when help from other bodies they were relying on was not forthcoming.

I cannot in this connection resist the temptation of quoting an extract from the observation of the learned Magistrate who was disposed to take rather a lenient view about what the Prosecution would call Moscow gold, with reference to Mr. S. H. Jhabwala. This is what the learned Magistrate observes on page 232 of the Committal Order. "The significance of these payments has been misunderstood. I do not consider it an unpardonable offence to accept the money under such conditions, (that is, during a strike) whoever the donor may be. If a strike relief fund is legitimate at all, it would be asking a lot of human nature to suggest that the source from which much needed donations come should be too strictly scrutinised. Acceptance by itself, therefore, does not mean much in my opinion."

But I was not concerned with "acceptance" at all because I had had nothing to do with any money other than what I received from the Trade Union Congress, the Unions affiliated to it, and the donations from workers and the members of the public. I was

primarily concerned in the course of these speeches to defend the principle that an appeal even to Moscow during a strike behalf of the workers is not reprehensible, and that those who pretended to see in it the hand of Moscow guiding what every impartial observer would admit to be a genuine trade dispute were carrying on unscrupulous propaganda against the workers. I must say in this connection that Mr. N. M. Joshi did not find anything wrong in receiving help from Moscow during strike and justified it in a Press interview. As a matter of fact in the statement of accounts submitted to the Cawnpore Session of the A. I. T. U. C. there is sum of Rs. 13000 entered as being received from Moscow. As Mr. Joshi explained at the Congress that there were no instructions available as to how the money was to be spent though he cabled to ascertain the same, that sum was utilised subsequently in giving relief to the B. N. R. Union, to Mr. Spratt in connection with the case of sedition against him at Bombay, and the balance was set apart for the purpose of organisation work. I have already said that I did not approve of the procedure Mr. K. C. Mittra adopted in sending the appeal which was in violation of a resolution passed by the Executive Council meeting at Cawnpore (D. 274, page 6), but I certainly did not think of carrying my disapproval to the point of dissociation because firstly as the Secretary of the Provincial Committee I could not do so on my own initiative against a Union which was affiliated to the Congress but not to the B. T. U. F., and secondly because, as I have tried to convey to your Honour, in reference to Chengail it would have been an unpardonable conduct in a Trade Unionist to do so at a time when there was a strike on particularly in view of the fact that it was more or less an offence relating to procedure than against any of the fundamental principles which form the basis of the Trade Union movement. I have consistently followed the principle, which I wish were followed with equal loyalty by those who indulge in high-sounding phrases, namely to help in a strike is the sacred and bounden duty of all who claim to be in the Trade Union Movement irrespective of the political colour that one may affect. The strike may be unconstitutional in the sense that it was declared without reference to the Union—if there happens to be one—the leaders of the strike may be people with whom one is not in political agreement or they might have made some tactical blunder. All these are matters to be taken up after the strike but on no account should they be taken up during the strike—far less to be made the pretext of venting spleen on those who were leading it, and making a political capital out of it. In the present condition of the Trade Union Movement in this country as I found it at the time it must be an extremely serious reason touching the very fundamental principles for which the Trade Union Congress stands

which could justify on the part of itself or anybody supporting or affiliated to it leaving the workers in the lurch because of blunders or faults of their leaders. Though I have referred to this matter in connection with the Chengail strike, yet I refer to this again to leave no room for misunderstanding on this score. A strike to me (D. 215, page 46) is the last weapon to be used, and workers should be discouraged to resort to it unless and until all possible efforts to bring about an understanding have been exhausted. But when there is an actual strike, to play the superior man and to adopt the attitude "I told you so" or to seek to dictate your terms on which you would condescend to cooperate is, to say the least of it, to betray the workers. The fact that the Communist charge all others who do not accept their creed with treachery to or betrayal of the workers does not absolve them from the same charge when they or those of them who play the same game under the cover of grandiloquent phraseology. It was because I rigorously followed this principle with the full approval of the Federation in the course of two years 1927 and 1928 that this body came to be regarded as a power to reckon with and at one time there was serious talk of extending its sphere to Behar and Orissa which would have meant great accession of strength to it by the affiliation of such powerful and established Unions as Jamshedpur Labour Association, the Colliery Employees' Association at Jharia besides the affiliation of the Central body of the B. N. R. Union.

To come back to the speeches, I did find it necessary to refute the calumnies that were being spread against the E. I. R. Union, to which Mr. Mitra by his unfortunate appeal to Moscow lent some points. It was hinted that the workers at Lillooah were happy—that they had practically no grievances. In other words pain was taken to impress on the public that no reasonable grievances existed—that the strike was being financed from Moscow. The Agent himself justified his attitude of "no compromise" as dictated by his knowledge, as he assured the public, that the whole show was Communist. It was in reply to this that I pointed out that these allegations unconsciously credit the Communists with power which no person or Party—whatever might be the school of thought to which he or it might belong—possesses. Not to speak of the ordinary Communists, not even the ghost of Lenin can do anything where there is no grievance or discontent. On the other hand, if there are long accumulated grievances and deep discontent it does not require a Communist to bring about the state of things caused by a strike. It was in illustrating this point that I gave certain facts in regard to wages paid at Lillooah in my speech marked P.2264, page 30, and contradicted a Calcutta paper which said that the average wages amounted to

Rs 55/2/- per head per month. "If that were so," I contended, "not even Lenin's spirit from Moscow could induce the men to go on strike." The idea underlying this argument against the theory of the interested parties that Labour disputes were being engineered by Moscow is also to be found reflected in my letter to the 'Statesman' on "Moscow gold" (D. 174 (6)) where I say that the workers are no fools and that those who are treated by their employers with the least consideration, not to say fairly, are not to be wheedled into a strike even by the "Moscow school" if it exists here. This idea is concretely illustrated by what Mr. Joshi wrote to me in D. 208 (13):— "We have here in Bombay a difficult situation to deal with. On account of the Millowners' reactionary spirit the extremists of the Workers' and Peasants' Party have hold of the situation." There was speech delivered by Lord Irwin in Calcutta in the winter of 1928 wherein, after condemning the Communists' activities, His Lordship hinted unmistakably that the best way to meet the menace was to improve the housing and working conditions of the workers. The speech was delivered at a dinner of the European Association and after promising the President of the Association that the Home Member was fully alive to the necessity of taking measures to deal with the Communist menace Lord Irwin went on to say:— "Legislation however can treat only the symptoms and will not of itself remove the root cause of the disease. For Communism takes its origin in social conditions and will always find out the weak spot in which to flourish, as noxious weeds will readily find the soil best suited to their growth. And as it will generally find its attack easiest on crowded industrial populations it is here we have to make our first stand against it. Communism will not hesitate to manufacture grievances where they do not exist, but unless it can lay its finger on real injustice it is not likely to succeed. And much can be done in any country to counter such an attack by employers keeping in close personal touch with those they employ and seeing that their wages and conditions of life are reasonable. If we are to fight communism successfully, it will be by the employers and Governments giving cause to the masses to believe that they—and not the Communists are the true friends of Labour." Of course this part of the speech of the Viceroy was to be treated as a counsel of perfection, while, as the present case shows, the Hon'ble Home Member did not let the grass grow under his feet in his attempts to treat only the symptoms. As D. 252, being my article in the 'Forward', will show I was disposed to consider the appointment of the Whitley Commission as some attempt to diagnose the disease though I was not certain how far the treatment was to be effective.

About the gist speeches mostly delivered at Bauria and

Chengail, besides what I have already said about them namely that they are not to be taken as an intelligent and connected summary of the speeches but a disconnected stringing together of a few passages, there is one very important thing to be noticed namely that out of the very large number of speeches delivered by me both at Chengail and Bauria a full report of not a single one has been produced but only the gist speech, about half a dozen has been tendered in evidence. I have nothing to say in regard to these so-called gist speeches except in reference to one namely P 2222. The meeting was called specifically to explain the Trade Union Movement and the utility of the Trade Unions to workers. At the very outset I began with the term union and explained that this contained the idea of unity which forms the essence of Labour Movement. I then briefly recounted the evils of disunion. I explained that the reason for our political subjection to another country is to be sought in our disunion. I pointed out, as Colonel Seely pointed out in his "Expansion of England," that England rules India not by any inherent superiority over us but because England knows the value of unity. I pointed out how this unity was demonstrated during the last war when all Parties combined to stand by their country right or wrong, while we are divided amongst ourselves by communal and religious jealousies. Then I pointed out that we ourselves, because of our lack of unity, are responsible for our political condition. Then I turned to our economic condition and here also I pointed out how lack of unity is responsible for the wretched condition of the working class. I mentioned how the skilled worker looks down upon the unskilled, how the Sardar instead of considering himself one of the workers identifies himself with the employing class and not only helps in the general exploitation but oppresses the workers on his own account by the extortion of bribes etc.—how the clerks though in no better position than the workers yet consider themselves as superior beings and with the help of the Sardars extort bribes etc. Then I pointed out how petty intrigues and squabbles amongst the workers strengthened the employers and explained what Trade Unions stand for, how Trade Unionism refuses to admit difference of religion, community, race or creed but that it divides human beings into two categories—the employers, and the workers, and stands for the unity of all the workers, so that they all might combine to improve their lot in life. For a specific and concrete example I turned to the British Trade Union Movement and traced its history. Towards the end of my speech I compared the condition of the British workers in the 18th and 19th century with the condition of the Indian workers in the 20th century and pointed out that however hard might be the lot of the Indian workers, they were in one sense slightly

better off than their British comrades, were namely that in the early stages of the Trade Union Movement the British workers had to conduct their Trade Union activities in secret because of the prohibition of law which regarded combination of workers as conspiracy in restraint of trade, whereas in India Trade Union activities in their initial stages can at least be conducted in the open and the Trade Union Registration Act in spite of its defective character stamps Trade Union activities with legal approval. Then I pointed out that in spite of the serious handicaps the British workers conducted their movement with such undaunted courage and selfless devotion that in 1924, though for a short time, the representatives of the British working class formed a government in England and in the near future they are expected to come back again with greater support at their back. I also took care to tell them that they need not be disheartened by the fact that it took over a hundred years for the British workers to achieve all this because the world has made great progress since then and under the influence of the 'time forces' the Indian Trade Union Movement has grown much more in power and influence in eight or nine years than the British Movement did in the first fifty years. This was in essence the trend of the whole speech but the so called "gist" gives quite a different impression because, as P. W. 36 S. I. G. Roy of Special Branch of Calcutta C. I. D. in reference to another such "gist" speech admitted. "As a longhand reporter I reported only such portions as I considered important from my point of view. I did not report the gist or substance of speech but only the portion I considered important." P. W. 98 S. I. Harindra Vijai Basu of Howrah D. I. B. who tendered P 2222 admitted on cross examination by me that "The general object of the meeting appeared to me to be to explain the utility and object of forming Labour unions. I only took notes of important matters. I did not try to summarise the speech as a whole. I do not remember when exactly I prepared that report. I usually submitted my report by next day. I do not remember whether Ghosh accused traced the history of British Unionism in that speech. I do not remember the context of the last sentence of his speech as reported. I do not remember if it related to a particular phase of that history. I do not recall if he said more after that sentence or referred to the difficulties of Indian Trade Unions, or to the Trade Union Act."

LEANING TOWARDS MOSCOW.

About my alleged "leaning towards Moscow," which the learned Magistrate discovers in some of my speeches, some further observations are called for besides what I have already stated in

explaining my reference to R.I. L. U. These observations are necessary because during a period of about two years just preceding our arrests even some of the very highest officials aided by a section of the press would seek to make the flesh of the Indians creep by dark hints and insinuations that India was fast heading towards Bolshevism. The late Mr. Langford James in the winter of 1928 delivered a speech at the European Association warning the Congress against coquetting with the Communist, while a booklet was issued by Mr. Coatman—the then Director of the Central Bureau of Information—containing extracts from the editorial notes and comments from the Indian Nationalist press wherever any appreciative reference was made to Soviet Russia. I particularly remember an editorial note from the Amrit Bazar Patrika which found a place in this booklet, that being a comment on the Soviet system of education. This booklet was mainly intended for circulation amongst the members of the Assembly in connection with the Public Safety Bill. The position during the period preceding our arrests was this that you could not make any reference to Soviet Russia in any other language than that of wholesale condemnation without being in the official estimation dubbed either as a Bolshevik or what is worse, having a sneaking admiration for Bolshevism. But this official disapproval has not prevented eminent scientists like Sir C. V. Raman or a poet like Sir Rabindra Nath Tagore from paying a glowing tribute to Soviet organisation for scientific research and their system of education, after they had visited Russia and seen things which they are interested in with their own eyes. Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru also has written a book which is an exhibit in this case and which unfortunately I had not the privilege of reading till I was here. It seeks to be a critical estimate of the achievements of the Soviet. But there is another aspect which has got to be borne in mind in analysing the average educated man's attitude towards Soviet Russia. The average educated man in India does not necessarily understand Socialism—far less the difference between Marxism of the Second International and that of the Moscow school of thought. He has a vague disapproval if not condemnation of Socialism which becomes particularly odious to him if it is of the Moscow variety in which case he has learned this much, it ceases to be Socialism and becomes Communism, invariably associated with Lenin and with, as a certain type of newspapers has taught him, Nationalisation of women and slaughter of all the weak and infirm people. But with all his disapproval or I may say even condemnation of Communism he has been forced to recognise one thing and that is the attitude of Soviet Russia towards the countries which were so long only independent in name but being extremely backward and

weak were being dominated by the Great Powers including pre-revolutionary Russia. He cannot shut his eyes to the fact that Persia, which was partitioned between Great Britain and Russia into two spheres of influence, the northern part being reserved for unhampered exploitation by Russia and the southern by Great Britain, became free because Soviet Russia unconditionally withdrew ^{and} also saw to it that Great Britain did the same. So was the case in Turkey and Afghanistan which respectively under the lead of Mustafa Kemal Pasha and King Amanulla Khan shook themselves free from all outside control with help from Soviet Russia. In regard to China also it could not be denied that Soviet Russia not only did forego all the concessions and privileges won from her (China) by Czarist Russia in collusion with other Powers before, during and since the Boxer Rising, but also rendered great moral and material help in enabling this unhappy country to shake off the foreign control. Of course it could not be denied also that the news about China as available in this country is so meagre and often so conflicting that nobody knows what is actually happening there—what is the present position and how far Soviet Russia or Capitalist Powers are responsible for the civil war, which we hear has been raging in that country. The fact is and it would not do either for the Imperialist or the Communist to shut his eyes to this fact that the average educated man particularly in a dependent country stands for complete self-determination for his country in all its logical implications. He wants no outside interference in setting the government of his country and what is even more important than the government namely the social structure of his country—no matter whether interference is organised or financed by Moscow, London or New York. If any country helps him by moral support and if and when necessary by material support in his endeavours to make his country free from outside control he will certainly look upon that country with friendly eyes, and will not, as far as it lies in his power, support any attempt to injure that country. On the other hand he is preferred to do his best to show his gratitude in all possible ways open to him.

The entire nationalist press in India whether representing the Liberal standpoint or the Congress school of thought reflects this view more or less. Whenever possible it gives publicity to all news of Soviet Russia particularly to her hostility to Imperialism, to her efforts in the education of her people, the organisation of industries and the encouragement of scientific research etc. Those who are closely connected with the Indian Labour Movement have to study carefully the progress or otherwise of one of the greatest experiments undertaken by Russia with the help of the huge resources of a mighty State. It is not necessary for one to believe ~~any~~ Communist theory, practice or

factics to admit that in Russia alone of all countries in the world a real attempt to bring about a socialist State is being made, and that the first requisite of Socialism, namely, that the means of production, distribution and exchange should be owned by the community at large and regulated through the State has been realised there to some extent. I say 'to some extent' because the State there as yet does not reflect the will of the community at large but is in the absolute control of a Party—comparatively small in proportion to the population but extremely efficient and well organised and subjected to the strictest military discipline. This may, and I sincerely hope it will, lead gradually to the broadening of the base of the popular will till at last it will correspond to the will of the majority, if not of the entire community. But it may, and though the experience of history supports this probability, I hope it will not, lead to a gradual narrowing of the base of the popular will and a party degenerating into a mere ruling caste, professing lip-deep homage to Proletarian Revolution and Dictatorship of the Proletariat as the only means for a classless society, but actually acting in such a manner as to perpetuate its own power.

D/- 10. 8. 31.

As a Trade Unionist I should be a traitor to the working class if I did not feel a thrill of delight for a state which claims to be the only Socialist state in the world—which claims to be a State where that class known all over the world as the class of have-nots and admitted to be in the immense majority has its welfare, interests and happiness at least professedly looked after as in no other State. But as one who believes in democracy as defined by Abraham Lincoln, namely Government of the people by the people and for the people, I cannot shut my eyes to the fact that a party which claims to be the only friend, philosopher and guide of the working class has put itself in a position greatly similar to what the British ruling class takes up in India, namely that they are *ma bap* of the masses and know what is for their good better than they or their educated country-men do. I can well understand the stern measures that the Soviet Government had to take against those Russians who were inviting and helping foreign armies to overrun their countries. No Government, good, bad or indifferent, democratic or autocratic, national or alien, can help that. But I confess I do not understand, and all the casuistry of the Communist apologists which I have come across has failed to convince me, that a party which is so intolerant of criticism and opposition within itself as to expel men like Trotsky, Zinovieff and Bukharin (the latter two I understand have been forgiven because they confessed to having seen the error

of their ways) can very long remain true to its ideals and principles and not degenerate into a mere ruling caste. The expulsion of Trotsky was decreed not at a time when the emergency of Civil War might have excused it—he was then indispensable as the man who organised the Red Army—but when Soviet power was well established. The real character and implication of the fate of Trotsky and the corollary to be deduced from it would be understood by an analogy drawn from British politics. Supposing Mr. MacDonald's Government expelled, imprisoned or interned Mr. Maxton who is said to be a thorn in their side of the Treasury Benches, or Mr. Baldwin's Government meted out similar treatment to Mr. Churchill because of his opposition to the Indian policy of the Government, (not that Mr. Churchill does not deserve it, but I am now referring to the intolerance of criticism) these political parties in Great Britain would have put themselves in the same position as the Communist Party of Russia by their treatment of Trotsky. The only excuse I have so far heard of this is that Trotsky was guilty of a breach of Party discipline. But that is exactly my point—breach of Party discipline may be punished by expulsion from the party. Admitting that he was guilty, in the face of Trotsky's own denial, why should the power and machinery of the State be set in motion to maintain the power and prestige of the Party—not against a counter revolutionary or against one who was plotting to overthrow the established regime—but against one who till the other day was always associated with Lenin even in the famous Red Army march that used to be sung by Soviet soldiers? If a person or several persons within a political party consider that the majority are pursuing a policy and tactics which, they are convinced, are harmful to the interests of and inconsistent with the principles of the Party why should they not be allowed the liberty to try to convert the majority to their views? To seek to get this small but persistent minority expelled is to confess that the leaders having the support of the majority are either not very sure of their ground and apprehend that their policy and tactics would not bear the scrutiny of reasoned criticism or that they have got a very poor idea of the judgment of the Proletariat which in the abstract is defied and sworn by but in practice is to be treated like a flock of sheep or a herd of cattle, who know not what is good for them, and to be led to their salvation by the 'elect.'

If this is the attitude of the Communist Party of Russia, which is looked up to for inspiration and guidance by all the other Communist Parties of the world, towards their own Party members with whom they worked and suffered for the common cause, it is no wonder that the members of other parties in the working class movement should be subjected to persecution for their opinions.

It is indeed the irony of fate that the Communists have been charged with employing the same tactics for the suppression of unpalatable opinions as the Capitalist Governments resort to all over the world to maintain their hold and power. I shall quote a few extracts from the official publications of the Labour and Socialist International to show how the Socialists are treated by the Soviet Socialist Republic, that is by the Communist Party of Russia which is in power. First I intend to quote a message sent to Kalinin, President of the Central Executive Committee of the Soviet Union, in 1927 by the two Presidents of the Commission of Enquiry into the conditions of political prisoners appointed by the Labour and Socialist International to ascertain the treatment accorded to Socialists in the different countries under Soviet or Fascist regime:—"On the occasion of the anniversary (that is the 7th November 1927, the 10th anniversary of the existence of the Soviet Union) you have issued an amnesty the provisions of which as to political prisoners are so elastically framed that it remains altogether obscure whether the amnesty applies to the numerous Socialists who are pining in the prisons and places of banishment of the Soviet Union. Your political police which proceeds by secret ways withdrawn from public control has the power to present every Socialist Party in the light of one that is aiming at the overthrow of the Soviet Government, irrespective of whether the party is really doing so or not, and likewise the power to consider every individual Socialist as an active member of the party without troubling whether he really is so or not."

"In this situation we view it as our duty to demand with the utmost emphasis on behalf of millions of workers in Europe that our Comrades in faith and party be no longer detained in the prisons and places of banishment of the Soviet Union, into which almost always they have been thrown without any procedure by a court, without legal guarantees, indeed without having incurred any real guilt. You have fixed a delay of a month for the preparation of direction respecting the application of the amnesty. There is yet time to remove the disgrace that thousands of workers, peasants and intellectuals must languish in Jail or banishment merely for thinking as we do, for rejecting the principle of the Communist Party monopoly, and for claiming on behalf of the Russian working class the most elementary right, namely that of being able to speak and to elect in freedom. The same abomination is committed in the Hungary of Horthy. We are striving against this infamy, we are fighting to secure full legality to the Communist parties in all countries; but we demand the same legality also for the Socialist Parties in the Soviet Union. In this

fight you attack us from behind through the example of suppression which you give. There is yet time, you can yet bring it about that a full amnesty should be extended to include all Socialists without exception whether active or passive, who have been convicted by your courts or by administrative channels on account of their Socialist political activity. There is yet time to abandon the course of poisoning the working class and to clear away one of the worst obstacles to its unity."

This communication, the report continues, was left unanswered but the facts gave the answer that the Soviet Government was not prepared to amnesty its working class political prisoners. Indeed a new wave of persecution began which was directed against the leaders of the opposition within the Russian Communist Party. Then the report gives an account of the persecution to which Trotsky, Rakowsky, Radek and others were subjected as an illustration of the system which brooks no freedom of opinion but subordinates everything to the dictates of an absolutist regime.

"In the English edition of the Bulletin of the Labour and Socialist International of June 1930 is published an appeal issued by its Executive to the workers of the Soviet Union inviting their attention to the dangers to the stability of the Soviet Union, in consequence of the persecution to which the peasants are subjected. It runs as follows:—

"To the workers of the Soviet Union I we make our appeal to you at a serious moment. We are well aware that attempts have been made to persuade you that the Socialist parties of the world are "Social Fascists", "lackeys of capitalism", and "traitors to the working class" but millions of workers who have been welded together in the hard school of the political and Trade Union struggle have overcome the greatest difficulties and created powerful Trade Union economic and political class organisation in order to fight with their help for the ideals of socialism. Could you really believe that these millions of fighting workers do not understand their own interests and "betray" themselves? On behalf of these millions of organised workers we make our appeal to you."

"Deep concern for the fate of the Russian Revolution weighs upon the socialist workers of all countries. They hear of hunger in your towns. They know that your conditions of Labour are often more unfavourable than those of the workers in the capitalist countries. They know of the failure of the forcible methods adopted for the collectivisation of the peasantry. They hear with the horror of the continuation, indeed of the intensification of the bloody terror."

"The L.S.I. fears that the continuation of this fatal policy could open up a cleft between the two classes on which the Russian Revolution is based—the workers and the peasants. If this should happen, if the peasants of the Soviet Union were filled with hatred against the working class and the Revolution, then the danger would arise that the embitterment and desperation of the peasantry would be misused by the White counter-revolutionaries for their aims. The horrible danger would arise of a new civil war in the Soviet Union.

"The victory for the White counter-revolution would be an enormous catastrophe, not only for the peoples of the Soviet Union, who would be robbed of the fruits of their great revolution, not only for the working class of the Soviet Union, whose heroic fight would be devoid of result, but also for the Labour Movement, for democracy and for peace throughout the world.

"Supported by decades of experience gained in the political struggles on the part of the working class of Europe, the L.S.I. declares to you, workers of the Soviet Union, that it rests with you to save the Russian Revolution, that the means is in your hands to avoid a catastrophe and bring about a peaceful solution of all the great problems of the Revolution.

"The Soviet Government pretends to govern in the name of the working class. It lies in your power, workers of the Soviet Union, to compel it to take the necessary steps. Whatever may be your opinions, whether you are communists, whether you belong to no political party, you must ally with the Socialists in order to save the Revolution.

"Above all, the alliance of the workers with the peasants must be re-established. We too wish the peasantry to achieve the development of their economic system on cooperative lines. But this must be done in a voluntary manner. There must be an end to forcible collectivisation, to any expropriation of the peasantry. Economic freedom and the right to the free disposal of the produce of his labour must be restored and guaranteed to the peasant. Only in this way can agriculture be built up again, food stuffs assured for the towns and the peasant won over as the friend and the ally of the worker.

"Freedom, which is as indispensable to the workers and peasants as air and water, must be restored to the peoples of the Soviet Union. Freedom of speech, freedom of association, free and secret elections, let there be an end to the death-penalty, no more mass executions, an amnesty for political prisoners, let there be an end to the scandal that men and women who lay in the prisons of

the Czar as fighters for the freedom of the working class, languish today in the prisons of the OGPU, in the concentration camps and in the places of banishment in Siberia!

"Through the realisation of these demands, the peoples of the Soviet Union will go forward in a peaceful manner, but conscious of their aim, towards democracy, in order to release on the basis of freedom the creative forces of the masses for the establishment of Socialism.

"The hearts of the Socialist workers of the whole world will be with the workers of the Soviet Union in this fight for the salvation of the Russian Revolution. On their behalf the L.S.I. is always prepared to extend a helping hand to the class comrades in the Soviet Union. We shall strike down the hand of International Capitalist reaction with all our strength if it attempts to take advantage of your difficulties in the interests of the counter-revolution.

"Workers of the world, unite! workers of the Soviet Union, unite with us for the salvation of the Russian Revolution and for the fight for democracy and Socialism."

(Executive of the L.S.I.)

I am not in the habit of making lengthy quotations as some do to cover up their poverty of ideas and language. But I have departed from my usual practice for two reasons, (1) to point out to the Prosecution that certain phrases and ideas are not the monopoly of the Communists as the learned Magistrate was pleased to find, following the cue of the Prosecution particularly in regard to the appeal I issued to the Jamshedpur workers, and (2) to show the untenable character of the claim put in by the Communist Parties everywhere, in pursuance of instructions received from their International, that they are the only true and sincere guides of the working class. A party within the working class movement which does not allow liberty of opinion to its own principles, which dares not meet on the plane of argument, discussion and propaganda for parties within the working class movement, which dares not allow the workers themselves to come to a free decision on vital questions of policy but takes advantage of political power to stifle criticism and punish the least opposition with imprisonment and exile does not differ very much in its tactics from those pursued by the capitalist class which, to perpetuate its domination, repeats the falsehood that the workers are unfit for the responsible task of Government and then seeks to put them down on the plea that they would overthrow the established Government and bring chaos and anarchy. These tactics as referred to in the publications I quoted from bear close resemblance to those employed by

ruling castes everywhere which claim to be the guardian of the masses.

My third and last quotation is of interest in view of the present case which though decided upon by the Conservative Party when in power is being carried on by the British Labour Party now in office—a case in which Communists, Trade Unionists and Nationalists are lumped together on a charge of conspiracy to bring about the Dictatorship of the Proletariat by the violent overthrow of the present Government! What I am going to quote is a letter of protest to the Councils of People's Commissars (which may be roughly taken for the Russian Cabinet) in Moscow. It was addressed by Vandervelde, the President of the Executive of the L.S.I., in accordance with its unanimous decision and is published in its Bulletin of February 1931.

“The ‘Vorwärts’ (‘Forward’—the premier organ of the German Socialist Party as the ‘Daily Herald’ is of the British Labour Party) publishes a telegram from the Soviet Agency to the effect that the enquiry on the subject of the counter-revolutionary organisation of an alleged bureau of the Central Committee of the Russian Social Democratic Party (the Mensheviks) discovered in the Soviet Union has been brought to an end, and that the affair will be referred to the supreme Court of the Soviet Union in a few days’ time.

“This news reached the Executive of the L.S.I. during its meeting in Zurich and it calls for a protest on its part, which must be all the more energetic as it has received very grave information with regard to the ill-treatment inflicted upon the accused persons in the prison where they are detained”.

“The Executive of the L.S.I. is in constant relation with the Russian Social Democratic Party, whose activity it follows with vigilance. It knows that, in the struggle which it is carrying on against the Bolshevik Dictatorship, the Russian Social Democratic Party is resolutely hostile to any counter-revolutionary intervention in the U.S.S.R., that it is definitely opposed to any attempt at organising revolts with a view to a violent overthrow of the Soviet regime, and that there is no informed person who could in good faith deny that it has always acted in the most decided manner within the L. S. I. in the sense of this opinion.

“Under these conditions, the fact of bringing before the revolutionary Judges men, whose whole previous conduct and whose repeatedly affirmed opinions protest against the accusation of which they are the object, constitutes a scandalous abuse of

force. It forms part of the Terrorist system and the campaign of calumny carried on against the Russian Social Democratic Party and its representatives, with the sole purpose of discrediting them in the eyes of the workers.

I am instructed by the Executive of the L. S. I., to raise the most energetic protest against such an abuse and to declare that by such actions Bolshevism is only widening the unfortunate split in the International working class, when the vital interest of the latter is to form a front in all countries against the forces of reaction which threaten it."

The Red Terror has been sought to be justified as a necessity forced on the Soviet Government by the infinitely more hideous White Terror. As I have said one can understand, if not excuse, the employment during foreign invasion or civil commotion fomented by alien powers, of the very tactics the working class movement has occasion to condemn daily when resorted to for the perpetuation of the capitalist system, worn out and unfitted for the requirements of the world at its present stage of progress. But it is beyond the comprehension of all Socialists why the same methods should be continued after the conquest of power has been stabilised, and employed—not against counter—revolutionaries but against the Communists themselves, not to speak of the other parties within the working class—to put down all the free expression of thoughts and opinions. I have tried to find an explanation and I have seen attempts to justify it on the plea that severe measures are necessary during a period of economic reconstruction. One would think that this is just the period when free expressions of opinion and candid views should be encouraged and welcomed—that the Russians as a nation may feel enthusiasm for the measures calculated to benefit the whole people and forging so fast ahead as to leave all the other countries behind—so that Socialists all over the world, whatever may be their difference of opinions with the Communists as to the methods by which capitalist rule should be replaced by a socialist regime, might glory in the fact of there being socialism in one country. Instead of that we find a Party governing an entire nation and being in turn controlled by a clique which while swearing by the Proletariat relentlessly removes those from its path who because of their intelligence and independence—the very qualities which should have made their cooperation extremely valuable—prove a menace to the perpetuation of cliquism.

The methods employed are well-known—they bear such a close familiar resemblance to those employed by the capitalist Governments all over the world. The only difference is the

difference which it makes by the substitution of the word 'counter-revolution' for the word 'revolution'.

On a close scrutiny by dispassionate observers with judicial temperament free from political bias the charges in a political case tried in Soviet or in capitalist countries may be found to be equally baseless—a mere penalising of opinions and activities which are unpalatable to the powers that be. In his "Sceptical Essays" while discussing "free thought" Mr. Bert and Russell observes "....In Russia one set of fanatics feels absolute certainty about one set of 'propositions, while in the rest of the world another set of fanatics feels equal certainty about a diametrically opposite set of equally doubtful propositions. These fanatics being in power unfortunately, from such a situation war, bitterness, and persecution will inevitably result on both sides." But it is only the Socialists alone who believe in Socialism, that is in a state of things which would give equality of opportunities to all for the development and full and free play of all that is best in mankind—it is the Socialists alone who are consistent in their condemnation of these methods whether they are employed by the Leninists (shall I say Stalinists?) or by the capitalists. It is they and they alone who can point out the inconsistency of both when either of them condemns the other for using these methods while it itself resorts to them without a scruple to stifle opposition. "We repudiate the right" says Mr. J. R. MacDonald, the present head of His Majesty's Government, in his book "Parliament and Revolution"—"We repudiate the right of the capitalist critics of the Russian Revolution to condemn the Dictatorship of the Proletariat in Russia, not only because their speeches show the most idiotic ignorance of the subject, but because their own actions and methods deprive them of the right of criticism."

This is a lesson to be drawn from Russia which should not be lost sight of by any who is heart and soul in the working class movement. As a matter of fact, while having the firmest faith in and the strongest devotion to the cause of Socialism—the only remedy and salvation for the countless millions of workers—manual or intellectual—whose interests are identical all over the world—Socialists who guard against the danger of a slavish imitation of the methods and tactics which brought about the establishment of the Soviets (admitting for a moment that the Soviet System of government is best calculated to bring about Socialism) that the methods and tactics were evolved out of the historical conditions peculiar to Russia and that the seizure of power by the Communists after the overthrow of the Czar was possible mainly, if not solely, owing to the abnormal situation of Russia at the time and not because of the intrinsic merit of the doctrines they preached. The abnormal

situation in Italy after the war produced Fascism, while in Germany it brought the Social Democrats into office. But in spite of all these drawbacks, for which the present regime in Russia is being subjected to criticisms by the Socialists all over the world, the working class all over the world particularly the organised workers have a soft corner in their hearts for Russia which has launched out on the greatest social experiment of the world. The reports of the delegations sent respectively by the organised workers of Great Britain and America, the first hand experiences recorded by Socialists like Vanderveld in his book "Three aspects of the Russian Revolution," by Mr. and Mrs. Snowden in their book "Through Soviet Russia", by Mr. Brailsford in "Soviets at Work" and Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru in 'Soviet Russia', indicate that while they are not prepared to accept the Revolution of November 1917, as the triumph of Communist ideology, methods and tactics, they are struck by the change for the better" in comparison with what the position was under the Czarist regime brought about in a short space of time in the condition of the Russian masses, and that in their criticisms they are always alive to the difficulties against which the Soviet Government has to contend—not the least of which is the sustained opposition of the capitalist Powers. I believe the attitude of the Socialists towards Soviet Russia has been briefly and correctly defined by Mr. George Hicks in his Presidential Address before the 59th Session of the British Trades Union Congress in the 1927 at Edinburgh (D 219). This is what he says "In regard to our relations with the Russian workers, I desire to say this. I know that a great deal of resentment is felt amongst us at what might well be termed the crude arrogance of the Russians in telling us how to conduct our own affairs ('Hear' 'Hear'). I think it should be remembered that the Russians have been reared in a hard and terrible school. Exile, imprisonment, and death have been the rewards meted out to those who actively engaged in the workers struggle against the old Czardom. We ought not to forget that those responsible for the leadership of a Soviet Russia see the world with that experience as a background. The methods they pursued are not necessarily those which are best suited to the countries other than their own. Our Russian comrades have suffered much and have learnt much and our sense of International solidarity and comradeship make it incumbent upon us to view this question in the biggest and the most generous way we can (Hear, Hear)."

I have had to deal with this question of what has been termed by the learned Magistrate as "leaning towards Moscow" at some length because I have found that the Prosecution has made much of the slightest appreciative references to Soviet Russia by any of the accused in the present

case. Between the two extreme views about Soviet Russia—the one held by the diehard capitalists who could see nothing good in it and would not rest in peace till the regime is altogether destroyed and the other held by the Communists who are ready to worship everything pertaining to Soviet Russia, there is in the world the vast mass of the people whose views and opinions make themselves felt in the long run. All this vast mass of people amongst the workers are more or less organised and I have given the attitude of the working class organisations all over the world which do not owe any allegiance to Comintern, who do not believe in the methods advocated by it but who yet take a good deal of interest in Soviet Russia and note carefully the extent of its success and failure. In other words the spectacle of a government professedly run in the interest of the working class, in its name, and under its authority has an appeal to the working class everywhere which otherwise may not have the slightest sympathy for Communism or may not even understand what it is and what its implications are. Those who are sufficiently advanced and have taken an active part in the workers' movement may be disposed to be critical, and sometimes the criticisms are very trenchant in the light of their own convictions which stood the test of long struggle and are the result of long experience—yet when all is said and done the fact is always present in their mind that for the first time in the history of the world a State has been set up which calls itself the Workers' and Peasants' Republic—the two great producing classes, numerically in majority, but hitherto doomed to the lowest rung of the ladder in a society based on individuals.

It was necessary for me to explain the attitude of the very large section of the working class which does not believe in the Communist ideology and tactics and is even opposed to the Communist International—because in this case the Prosecution has followed a curious logic. It has adduced evidence of the participation of the accused in Sacco and Vanzetti demonstration meetings, in demonstrations against Simon Commission, adverse criticisms of the Labour Office at Geneva or appreciative references to Soviet Russia to prove that the accused against whom this sort of evidence is adduced are either Communists or have so far accepted their view point as not to debar them from taking part in what the Prosecution make out as essentially a Communist conspiracy. The Prosecution argue like this: The Communists regard the I. L. O. with to quote the learned Magistrate "peculiar disfavour": this particular accused did so: therefore this particular accused is a Communist. Or the Communists made it a point to demonstrate about Sacco and Vanzetti: this particular accused took part in such demonstration therefore it follows that he is a Communist. But unfortunately the

fallacy lies in the fact that not all those who took part in these demonstrations or hold these views are Communists. This is I believe what is called the fallacy of the undistributed major premise. This sort of evidence either taken individually or in its cumulative effect proves very little but the Prosecution have gone to such an absurd length that we find even the learned Magistrate drawing inference from the use of words like "solidarity", and "workers of the world unite", "comrades", and "youngfraternally" as an evidence of participation in this conspiracy.

Revolution or Evolution.

This controversy is perhaps as old as the human society as it represents two tendencies born of the law of progress which involves change. I can add very little if at all to the contributions— theoretical and practical—made by the master minds of all the ages. My scope, considering the place from where I am speaking is extremely restricted and is limited only by the need for the occasion. The occasion which calls for this exposition is a passage reported imperfectly from the speech I delivered at Harish Park in one of the meetings I organised under the auspices of the Bengal Trade Union Federation in connection with the Lillooah lockout. The passage as reported stands thus: "It is to remove these ordinary human wants (that is food, education, proper medical treatment etc) that we have today gone on strike, and if this humble purpose is fulfilled it will be enough for us. And this is also the demand of the workers' party. Whenever we make known these demands, many people forth-with say to us that this Evolution of ours is the same as Revolution. In that case possibly the political reform which is taking place with us is also revolution, but they forget that a revolution takes place suddenly, whereas the process of Evolution is very slow. And as soon as it is stopped it turns out to be Revolution. What happens when the escape of steam is prevented? It bursts through but if it is permitted slowly to escape no harm ensues....." I have already in dealing with the so-called fully reported speeches from one of which the above is an extract, pointed out their imperfect character. I leave it to your Honour to judge in view of what I have said before how disjointed the whole speech seems to be with terms such as "indistinct", and.....interspersed between, and asterisks in the end indicating a confession on the part of the reporter that he could not follow the speech to the extent which would make the report an accurate one. But the difficulty increases in view of the fact that the Court will have to arrive at a finding through the medium of translation and that too is not absolutely an invariably correct as would appear from the admission of the translator, amongst other things, in regard to the

extract quoted, that "workers' party" is wrongly translated and should be "workers".

D/- 11.8.31.

Mr. Brailsford asked about this passage said that he could not be sure about it and no wonder. But he correctly gathered the sense when he said that "if the passage means that evolution if arrested inevitably leads to revolution, that is a doctrine to which the Second International subscribes."

I have already said that my speeches were the result of some thought and preparation and that I used to select the theme beforehand. Now I wanted to impress on the public that it should not be misled by propaganda carried on against the workers in general and the Lillooah workers in particular simply because they were trying to improve their working conditions and their lot as human beings. Their demands were moderate, legitimate and reasonable. To say that their demands should not be conceded to and that they should be put down, otherwise the country would be faced with revolution, was to talk nonsense, because if this contention were true—and I suspected that those who were saying this themselves did not believe what they were saying—then no reform should be encouraged at all—not even the piecemeal political reforms which were being conceded to us. Then I pointed out that it is the people of this sort, who are responsible for bringing about revolution, because they are always opposed to progress and reforms, and if and when they get their way they do their level best to suppress the legitimate demands and thus deepen discontent. When discontent is deep and universal, when demonstrations to give vent to the popular feeling are suppressed there is bound to be an out-burst—just as a kettle of boiling water is bound to burst if the steam instead of being allowed an outlet accumulates in it. Progress is the law of the world and is inevitable. But those who have political power in their hands can retard or accelerate it. If timely concessions to legitimate demands are made instead of suppressing them progress is peaceful and though slow yet steady. This is giving the law of evolution free play. Otherwise revolution breaks out and the ferocity with which it does so is to be measured by the extent of the ferocity with which the legitimate demands of the people were sought to be put down. Revolution may break out suddenly as the experience of history shows but it is the result of long accumulating discontent and suffering and of despair. Revolution can never be engineered by a few people nor can it be imported, as has been aptly said, in a "carpet bag." Then in this connection I pointed out to the several strikes that were going on at the time and stressed on the demands of the workers with particular

reference to Lillooah. My intention was to drive home to the public that timely concessions, even if small, are calculated to turn discontent into the constitutional channel of agitation, but that, if an attitude of no concession is taken and legitimate agitation is sought to be suppressed, those who are responsible for these policies and measures are simply bringing about a condition of things which is sure and which may culminate in a revolutionary outburst. This is a view to which all Rational persons subscribe, and, as Mr. Brailsford says, "it is the point of view of that section (the more moderate section of the Second International) that if revolutionary or constitutional methods fail, resort to revolutionary methods becomes more or less inevitable." I shall quote an extract from a book called "Must Britain travel the Moscow road?" written by Mr. Norman Angell in reply to Trotsky's "Whither Britain is going." This book, as was stated by Mr. Brailsford in his evidence, represents the views of the more moderate section of the Second International. If your Honour will turn to the synopsis of Chapter I of this book which is entitled "is there a Red peril, and who are revolutionaries?" you will come across the following:—

"The question of revolution will be determined not mainly by labour leaders, still less by "paid agitators," but by the policy of those at present in possession—will that policy show sufficient adaptability to changed conditions?—if not, it might easily render revolution as "inevitable" as the Marxians declare it to be—hypnotised by the ruin labour *might* cause to property, we do not seem to have noticed the ruins and revolutions which governments of law and order have actually accomplished, under our eyes and may accomplish again,"

In this connection I may point out that the Socialists differ from the Communists in their attitude towards revolution in this, that the Communists start on the assumption which to them admits of no doubt (if anybody doubts it, he becomes a traitor to the working class, a hireling and what not of the capitalists) that the revolution is bound to come and is the *sine qua non* of the change from Capitalism to Socialism. Though their motto is, "Revolution for the masses and not the masses for revolution," they would not admit of the slightest possibility of the masses coming to their own without a bloody revolution. The Socialists on the other hand refuse to give this assumption the sanctity of universal truth and point out to various changes effected in men's outlook with the progress of science and many measures of a socialistic character and based on Socialist principles taken even by capitalist Governments. To them revolution is an evil and to be avoided

unless the powers that be, through their absolute failure to move with the times or to adapt themselves to the state of things brought about by the progress of science and the growing needs of society, force the victims of status quo to choose the alternatives of either meekly submitting to their lot indefinitely or putting an end to the system which is responsible for it. Socialists would welcome genuine progressive reforms which would ultimately lead them to their goal. They justify this attitude by pointing out that revolution even if successful does not always lead to the state of things desired or at any rate the revolutionary regime may have under the stress of necessity to adopt a number of the very measures which they had hitherto condemned and wanted to put an end to by revolution. These measures therefore to the extent of their reintroduction, retard the realisation of revolutionary aims. In these circumstances it is not proper that revolution should be idealised, though unfortunately its possibility cannot altogether be ruled out. That in Russia the revolutionary government has been forced to adopt many measures which were hateful to a degree and to end it was the object of revolution cannot be denied. That is why hasty generalisations based on Russian conditions and experience should not be taken as the basis for a programme to be blindly followed everywhere.

It may be noted in this connection that this revolutionary fervour of the Russian Communists to which the Communist International owes its inception has been actuated by the instinct for self preservation. Just as when the industrialisation of Great Britain was going on apace after the industrial revolution, finding that their peculiar economic conditions made it absolutely necessary to have free and unrestricted trade with the rest of the world, to enable her to get food for her sustenance and raw materials for her factories in exchange for the finished products that they manufacture, just as British industrialists aided by patriotic economists were able by sustained propaganda to raise for a time at least the policy of free trade dictated to her by her peculiar economic needs to the dignity of a principle of universal application—so the Russian Communists and particularly the master minds of the Bolshevist Revolution headed by Lenin saw clearly that workers revolution in more than one country would guarantee the security of the Soviet State against which the Capitalist Powers were up in arms. Great hopes were entertained of the industrially advanced countries like England, France and Germany. But these hopes were frustrated because the objective conditions for revolution and consequently the desperation which drives people to despair and to resort to drastic steps were not there—the workers being better off than ^{in the} rest of Europe though there was discontent because of the

dislocation of industry after the war. Their efforts met with relative success in Germany,—the Communist Party there is perhaps stronger than in any other capitalist country—but that was because Germany was a defeated country. But still the Communist Party was not strong enough to bring about revolution. In England the Communist Party is the weakest in Europe because of the long and well-established traditions of Trade Unionism which have made the lot of the British workers happier than that of their comrades in other countries of Europe and because of the democratic constitution which holds out to the workers the hope of being some day by constitutional means in possession of the government machinery and political power without having to wade through blood.

Being baffled in their efforts to bring about the revolution in these countries they have concentrated their energy and attention on the colonial countries. Here, as I have pointed out in connection with the League against Imperialism, they are at a greater advantage than they are in the countries which are politically free. The economic condition in the colonial countries is also far worse than what it is in the European countries. In the case of India it is particularly pointed out that Indian conditions approximate to conditions in Russia and, it is argued, that India, therefore, should travel the Moscow road. But fortunately or unfortunately the conditions are not alike though on a superficial glance there may be some similarities, namely the vast area of large and backward population most of which lives on agriculture and a Government which is not responsible to the people. But on a closer view differences appear which properly analysed do not support the Moscow logic. In Russia the Czarist Government was autocratic and, not only so but was absolutely corrupt and demoralised. Under the stress of the World War which had not the backing which the other Governments more or less democratic in character were receiving from their respective peoples, the machinery of the Government broke down. The Kerensky Government which came into power as a result of this almost bloodless revolution failed to gauge the popular will and was crushed in its turn because of its determination to carry on the war with which the people were completely fed up. Taking advantage of this chaotic situation Lenin and his followers came out with the slogan of peace, bread and land and were acclaimed everywhere. So the revolution may be called a Bolshevik revolution in the limited sense that the leaders of this revolution were Bolsheviks and not in the sense that the support given to them by the people was due to the fact of their being inspired with Bolshevik ideals. There is another aspect also.

The conditions necessary for the success of a socialist revolution even as laid down by Marx were not present in Russia, though Lenin gave his own interpretation of Marxism and fashioned it to suit the requirements of Russia. But, even when the revolution established the Communists in power, they headed by Lenin had to retrace their steps and introduce the New Economic Policy, while Lenin's successor Stalin had also to step backward to realise the five years' plan and borrow some of the capitalist methods in production. As Kautsky observes in his book "Terrorism and Communism" :— it is not so easy to organise as it is to expropriate. A capitalist concern is a complex organisation which finds its intelligence in the capitalist himself or in his representative. If it is desired to abolish capitalism some form of organisation must be created, which should be possible of functioning as well if not better, without the capitalist head. . . . It demands a certain set of conditions of a material as well as of a psychical order, a high development of capitalistic organisation, not only of production, but also of the import and export of the raw materials. Moreover, it also demands a proletariat which is conscious of its duties, not only towards its own neighbours and comrades but also towards society as a whole—a proletariat, moreover, which has become accustomed to voluntary discipline and self-administration through long years of mass organisation; and which finally is intelligent enough to distinguish the possible from the impossible and the scientifically educated leader with character from an ignorant demagogue without a conscience."

In comparison with the workers and the advanced industrial countries of Europe Russian workers were backward and less organised. Russian industry was less advanced. But in comparison with India Russian industry in 1905 was much more developed than Indian industry in 1931 and Russian workers far more organised and trained for organised actions than Indian workers of today. These are some of the facts amongst others which should not be lost sight of by those who take part in the working-class movement and have some responsibility for deciding its policy. But the difficulty of the Communists is that as a party they have to obey implicitly the instructions of the centre which is situated thousands of miles away from their sphere of activities. If it is the policy of the Comintern to lay down that it is revolution alone that will bring salvation to the masses and nothing else they will have to repeat it parrot-like without the least reference to the local conditions of the country to which they belong and where they work. But other parties within the working class movement who neither accept the limitations sought to be imposed on them, as has been said, by the capitalists, nor the cut-and-dried formulae the

mechanical adherence to which is insisted upon by Moscow, formulate their own policies with due regard to the circumstances of the particular country they are working in. They refer to revolution not as a means through which the working class must go under all circumstances but as an evil which may be forced on the working class by an unintelligent capitalist class unwilling to make timely concessions and carry out much needed reforms for the betterment of its conditions.

Q. The following evidence relates to the part taken by you in the A.I.T.U.C. and the B.T.U.F.:— P. 544 (3), P. W's 111 and 119, P. 10, 1383, 37, 29, 479, 48, 545 (1 to 5), 26, 34, 36, and P. W's 123 and 254. Have you anything to say about this evidence?
All-India Trade Union Congress and its Provincial Committee.

A. Since the winter of 1925 when I first began to take an active part in the Trade Union Movement I have been studying the conditions of Labour in our country as well as the history of Labour Movement in other countries. Obviously I had easier access to a detailed history of the working class movement in England than of similar movements in other countries, some smattering knowledge of which I could incidentally gain in the course of my studies. The reason why in my speeches at Trade Union meetings I used to cite the example of the British Trade Union Movement was that I knew about it much more than I knew of the movements in other countries. The steady growth of the British Trade Union Movement in the face of strenuous capitalist opposition appealed to me very much and I was also struck by the intelligent policy that the British Capitalist class began to pursue since after the Chartist Movement—a policy which weaned the British workers from the revolutionary path and diverted their energies into constitutional channels. There were of course many factors at work which enabled or compelled the capitalists to follow a policy more liberal and enlightened than what was, has been or could be followed in other countries. But the fact remains that the basic principles of the British Trade Union Movement influenced my outlook to a large extent.

There was another factor which drew me to the study of the British Labour Movement even before I took part in the Indian Trade Union Movement. As a journalist connected with the premier Nationalist Dailies in Calcutta I knew that since after the war the Indian Nationalists were beginning to find an ally in the growing British Labour Party which they considered would go further than even the British Liberals did in helping the cause of nationalism and it was believed that the British Labour party pledged to oppose Imperialism should at least never betray India Nationalists as Lord Morley (Mr. John Morley was at one time regarded as a Radical) when he became the Secretary of State for

India. In 1924 Indians had the shock of their lives when they found that amongst other things the British Labour Party in office headed by Mr. J. Ramsay MacDonald, the author of "The Awakening of India"—a widely read book in India—gave its seal of approval amongst other things to the policy of detaining hundreds of our young men in prison without trial. The next year, after the Labour Government was thrown out of office, Messrs. Jhonstone and Sime visited India 'on behalf of the Dundee Jute Workers' Union, and they tried, though not very convincingly, to explain away the policy of British Labour as being dictated by the fact of its being in office and not in power. But in the course of the several speeches which I carefully followed, and I was personally present at one of the meetings, he, that is Mr. Jhonstone, gave a reasoned exposition why the British organised Labour wanted to stand by India, particularly by the working class of India. It was not sentimental love for a people deprived of the blessings of freedom but hard material considerations, he said, which weighed with organised Labour in Britain in coming to the help of the Indian workers. Then he explained the economic basis of the slogan 'Workers of the world unite' (D. 176 and page 43 of D 544 and also Mr. Brailsford's evidence).

So when I began to take an active part in the Trade Union Movement my studies of the history of the British Trade Union Movement had particular reference to the extent that it would be possible for the Indian Trade Union Movement to have the British Movement as an ally and the extent that the British Movement should be taken as an example to follow. Unfortunately the attitude of the British Labour Party towards the Simon Commission, denounced by all reputable sections of Indian opinion—an attitude for which the British Trade Union Movement could not escape its due share of responsibility—was not such as to encourage much faith in the usefulness of the alliance, though at the same time I must say that the arrival of Messrs. Purcell and Hallsworth as fraternal delegates of the British Trade Union Congress considerably allayed feeling against the British Trade Union Congress. I was greatly influenced by the attitude of neutrality which these two fraternal delegates observed in regard to the question of the Simon Commission (D 270) which the All India Trade Union Congress decided to boycott, and it influenced me in supporting the appointment of the British Trade Union Congress as the representative of the Indian Movement abroad in preference to the Workers' Welfare League. Of course it was obvious that the former was much more powerful and influential than the latter and had far greater resources and was expected to be more useful as the fraternal delegates promised it would.

However it was this consideration, namely, that no outside party will be of very much help to the Indian Movement unless it be for some limited purpose, that led me to conclude that the Indian Movement must proceed on lines of its own—taking help where available but expecting none and committing itself to none of the different parties in the working class. This was a policy which I followed throughout and I would summarise as “detachment but not isolation abroad—organisation and exposition (of the Trade Union principles and propaganda) at home”. Having studied deeply and critically the history of the Labour Movement, the principles which formed its basis and the policy it followed at different times, as also the different schools of thought in the working-class movement as they developed, particularly since after the Russian Revolution and War, I compared the knowledge I had received to my experience in the Indian Trade Union Movement and this study and experience made me ideologically a socialist who believes in a democracy based on adult suffrage controlling the means of production, distribution and exchange. But I also regard society as an organism and as such no radical change can be forced upon it unless it is duly prepared for it, that is no radical change can be imposed by a resolute minority upon an unwilling though unorganised majority without causing serious back slides. But as I have already said I did not think it would be proper for the Indian Trade Union Movement at its present stage of development to be affiliated to any of the world organisations and thus restrict its scope for growth. There were persons including even such an eminent man as Mr. C. F. Andrews who opposed the affiliation of the Trade Union Movement to the I.F.T.U., while there was a small but organised group which wanted it to be affiliated to the Red International. I stood out against both and was not for affiliating our movement to any one of them (P 2008), because in the present position of the Indian Trade Union Movement the workers themselves count very little in any decision of this sort one way or the other. The real opinion of the workers could not be ascertained unless and until they have learnt to act and speak through their own Trade Unions to which at least an appreciably large number of workers in a particular industry must belong as regular members. The workers’ movement in a country should take the colour and character which the workers themselves seek to give to it and not any particular set of people drawn towards the movement by their own ideals and seeking to impose on them their views according as they belong to one or the other school of thought which the movement has developed. That is why I devoted my attention almost exclusively to the organisation of strong unions which would develop experience of their own in the course of their endeavours to improve their working conditions, and would be in a

better position to Judge which way is better calculated to lead to their goal. This is how I concluded an article on the All India Trade Union Congress at Jharia contributed to the Amrit Bazar Patrika of 30th December 1928. "Organisation is the immediate task, let me repeat, before the Congress. For gaining the objective it (A. I. T. U. C.) would work together with and receive the assistance from any party, group or organisation which offers it. Let our workers be organised and strong and they would themselves decide the course they should adopt and the Congress is bound to take the complexion and character they choose to give it. It is useless at this stage to pass high-sounding resolutions framed in the language of Leninism while at the same time ~~looking~~^{breathing} in our heart of hearts that very few of the resolutions have a chance of being acted upon, while most of them would add to the difficulties which are already numerous enough to satisfy the most militant amongst us."

D/- 14-8-31.

The Indian Trade Union Movement is perhaps the youngest Trade Union Movement in the world. It was in 1920 that the All-India Trade Union Congress was founded at Bombay. At that time there were hardly half a dozen unions in India and all of them taken together could not perhaps boast of a membership exceeding ten thousand. In the older Trade Union Movement we find the development was from below upward, that is the National or Central organisation was formed after the unions in the several industries had grown strong and had felt the necessity of a powerful Central organisation which would be able to formulate general policies and demands common to all sections of the workers, and coordinate the activities of the different unions towards realisation of common aims and objects. But in India such was not the case. The Central Organisation came into being before the workers in most of the industries were organised or even before the few Unions that were newly formed could be well organised and numerically strong. One of the chief reasons for forming this Central Organisation was the provision in the treaty of Versailles which created the International Labour Office at Geneva and laid down that an annual Conference should be held there for the discussion of International Labour problems with a view to recommend improvements in the conditions of Labour by Legislation. The recommendations of the Geneva Conference are binding on the Governments represented at it subject to their ratification by the legislators of those countries. Certain provisions have been made by which Governments, employers and workers are represented at the Conference. The representative character of a delegate may be questioned and, if questioned, the matter is referred to a Credentials Committee.

It was found that in the absence of a Central Organisation which can speak with some amount of authority on behalf of the workers the Government would be left with unfettered discretion to make their nominees as Labour delegates and advisers while the employers, on the other hand, have their well-established organisation. Whatever might have been the circumstances to which the A. I. T. U. C. owed its origin, that it removed a growingly-felt demand was proved by the enthusiasm which characterised the proceedings of the first Session at Bombay, though most of those who took part in it were trades people, merchants and intellectuals with humanitarian sympathies. The second Session which was held at Jharia the next year—one of the great centres of the Coal Mine Industry—was attended by, amongst others, about 20,000 miners. In short, when I joined the movement in 1925 I found the A. I. T. U. C. a well-established organisation with growing prestige amongst the workers. But unfortunately I found that all sorts of 'climbers' and adventurers were also seeking a foothold in the organisation by means of 'paper' unions. The idea of these persons was to get elected either as delegates or advisers to Geneva or, if possible, to get nominated by the Government to a seat on the Legislature as a Labour representative. The Central Organisation was not yet strong enough, as Mr. N. M. Joshi, the General Secretary, who visited Calcutta early in 1926, confessed to me, to keep a strict watch over or properly check the returns and reports submitted by the Unions, though, as I could perceive, he was doing his best under the circumstances. From the very first Mr. N. M. Joshi impressed me, as he impressed others who came in touch with him, as one thoroughly understood the character of the movement, was very well posted in regard to its various developments in other countries and had great experience of the workers with whom he had to come in very close touch in connection with his social service activities carried on under the direction of the Servants of India Society founded by Gokhale. Since our first meeting up to the time of my arrest I had never at any occasion to differ from him in regard to questions of policy except once, and that was in regard to the affiliation of the A. I. T. U. C. to the I. F. T. U. I was, like many others including Mr. C. F. Andrews, opposed to affiliating the A. I. T. U. C. with either the Amsterdam or the Moscow body. As a matter of fact there was very little room for difference of opinion at that stage amongst those who were sincerely trying to build up a powerful Central Organisation with strong and well-organised unions as its constituents.

Early in 1926 a dispute arose in the Bengal Trade Union Federation which threatened to develop into a split. The dispute continued for some months and was settled by the arbitration of

Dr. S. K. Dutt, at the time the General Secretary of the Y.M.C.A., nominated by the Executive Council of the A. I. T. U. C. at its meeting at Bombay in April 1926. But after some time the dispute broke out again and ended after the Executive Council meeting in Calcutta in December 1926, and the Bengal Trade Union Federation, of which I was the Secretary as a result of the dispute, was recognised by the Central Organisation. It was about this time that Donald Campbell made on his own initiative some efforts for settlement of this dispute and saw me on the eve of the Executive Council meeting at my home and subsequently wrote to me (P 77) just an hour or two before the meeting took place. He attended the Executive Council meeting as a representative of the E. B. R. Indian Employees' Union.

During two full years, namely 1923 and 1928, all my energy was devoted to the task of organisation and proving as much useful to the affiliated unions as possible for the Federation with its extremely limited resources. I need not dilate on the organisation work because I have dealt with it already in connection with Chengail and Bauria, except to state that there were two other unions organised by the Federation, of which one was the Howrah Workers' Metal Union and the other the Dock Workers' Union—the latter subsequently through the efforts of the Federation was amalgamated with the Port Trust Mariners' and Dock Workers' Union, a leaflet of one of which, recovered from my search, was put in as a Prosecution exhibit but, subsequently dropped and restored by me. As regards the assistance rendered to the affiliated Union, certain letters from the B.N.R. Indian Labour Union have been filed as D. 207 (6) and 207 (10). There are also in the records documents showing the efforts made through the Federation for the settlement of Lillooah, Bauria and Scavengers' strike. Besides this, the Jamshedpur Labour Union requested me to intervene in the dispute between Homi and itself and subsequently I was nominated by the General Secretary of the A.I.T.U.C. with the approval of the President, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, to act as the Secretary of the Enquiry Committee they formed in pursuance of the resolution of the Jharia Session of the Congress to enquire into the disputes with a view to bring about a settlement. It is in connection with this that an appeal to the Jamshedpur workers was drafted.

But while I was engaged in these activities I was also alive to the necessity of purging the Trade Union Congress and its Provincial Committee of 'paper' Unions. I was supplied with a list by Mr. Joshi of the unions which failed to pay their affiliation dues to the Congress and at his request undertook an enquiry into their conditions. The result was such as to convince me that

drastic steps were necessary against a number of these unions, which did not exist except on paper and some of which were in the habit of submitting false and exaggerated returns about membership to gain increased representation at the Executive Council of the A.I.T.U.C. and consequently in the Provincial Committees. So when Mr. Joshi raised at the Executive Council at Delhi in February 1928 the question of the position of the unions whose affiliation fee was in arrears, I gave a brief account of the state of things as disclosed by my enquiry and suggested that the Congress should undertake the enquiry through an impartial man of its own choice. Mr. Chaman Lal supported my suggestion and named Spratt for the task. Mr. Joshi suggested that the enquiry should be conducted by a Committee of two of which I as the Provincial Secretary should be one. So the Council formed a Committee with Spratt and myself as members to enquire into the conditions of Unions in Bengal (D. 274, pages 9 and 10). I have already stated the procedure adopted in this enquiry, that is that in view of my preoccupation with other matters Spratt should conduct the enquiry into the affairs of as many unions as he could for the time being and subsequently if I found that more information on certain points was wanted or that further enquiries were necessary I would supplement Spratt's investigations as well as take up the enquiry about the Unions left over by Spratt before we settled down to write the report. Our first step in the matter is embodied in D 209 (4) over our joint signatures.

In this connection I may refer to P 479 a letter purporting to be from Spratt to Muzaffar Ahmad: "I have every hope of being able to leave Bombay for Calcutta this week in consequence of a resolution of the E. C. of the T. U. C. whereby Kishori Lal and myself are to inquire into Bengal Trade Unions and report on their existence or otherwise. My travelling expenses will be paid....." As would appear from the above Spratt's travelling expenses were paid by the A. I. T. U. C. and as I have already said more than once I regarded Spratt as the representative of the A. I. T. U. C. because besides being deputed by the A.I.T.U.C. Executive in February 1928 at Delhi he was also elected to be a convener of the Labour Constitution Sub-Committee formed by the Congress at its Cawnpore Session in 1927.

In this connection I would invite the Court's attention to two letters I addressed to the Statesman namely D 174 (6) and D 174 (2) the first in reply to an editorial charging what the editor called "The Moscow School" with being "actively at work in industrial India", and the other in reply to an anonymous "Indian Trade Unionist", questioning the representative character of Mr. Chaman Lal,

who withdrew from the Empire Commonwealth Labour Conference in London in protest against the ruling of the President prohibiting him from tabling any resolution about the Simon Commission. The idea underlying both attacks is, as I understood it, the same. In the one it was sought to be made out that the Indian Trade Union Movement was being dominated by the "Moscow School of thought," while in the other it was insinuated that the Indian Trade Union Congress was being dominated by "a clique of politicians" like Dewan Chaman-Lal, who was a Barrister-at-Law and a Sywarajist member of the Legislative Assembly. As a Provincial Secretary of the T. U. C. I considered it my duty to reply to both, which I considered to be libellous, and remove the misleading idea sought to be conveyed about the Trade Union Movement in India. In D 174 (6) I stated the circumstances which brought Spratt to Calcutta and pointed out that "The Indian Trade Union Congress is open to all who agree to be bound by its rules." In this the Trade Union Congress was but following the established practice of all political bodies including the British Trade Union Congress and the Indian National Congress. In D 174 (2) I pointed out that, "in the T. U. C. there are, as in other organisations, certain persons who are better known for their political than for their Labour activities (that may be due to the fact that politics afford greater opportunities of bringing people into the limelight than Labour activities at this stage of the Movement) but that certainly does not justify any one to characterise the Congress as "a clique of politicians." As a matter of fact I wanted rather to remove any misleading idea that may be formed about the Trade Union Movement than to defend either Chaman Lal or Spratt personally, both of whom I believed were well able to take care of themselves. My speeches as well as D 174 (6) would also indicate that my view about the Moscow School was always decided and pronounced. "Where Moscow is, it is not in Calcutta. Whether it would be in Calcutta or in any part of Industrial India or when it would be depends on how the State and the private employers handle the problem of conceding to the legitimate demands of the hard-worked and ill-paid producers of industrial wealth."

It was this idea which governed all my speeches and writings to counteract the mischievous propaganda against the Trade Union Movement. It was this idea which prompted me to contribute the article to the "Forward" entitled "Whitley Commission— is it a blow to Trade Union Movement?" (the draft copy of which is D 252) published in its issue of 7th March 1929 in reply to an article named "Whitley Commission — a blow to Trade Union Movement," which appeared in that paper over the pseudony.

"A Labour Leader" (who as I learnt afterwards from the Forward Office and said so to Mr. N. M. Joshi in a letter D 251 was Mr. B. F. Bradley). I had not much faith in what the Commission would recommend or in the possibility of the recommendations, whatever they might be, being carried out. But as I pointed out; "A real enquiry into the conditions of Labour is bound to give the lie direct to those who are spreading the mischievous theory that frequent strikes in India for the last two years have been engineered by gold and agents from Moscow and prove that they are due to only one reason, namely what Labour Leader really calls intolerable conditions of employment..... A real enquiry is bound to clear the Trade Union Movement of the suspicion that has gathered round it thanks to the combined propaganda of capitalists, loyalists and some agents provocateurs masquerading as Communists, that it is a movement based on the ambition of some self-seeking persons, maintained either by foreign capitalists bent upon ruining Indian industries or by Moscow bent upon bringing about a bloody revolutions." My concluding observations were, "let us therefore rather for the time being watch over the developments and be busy collecting facts in regard to the conditions of employment in the various industries, so that if the Commission really approximates in personnel, object and procedure to what we consider it should be, we may be ready to help it to the best of our ability." The report of the Commission now published justifies what I said then, that is in March 1929. It is admitted on all hands to be a very valuable document containing a lot of useful information about the Indian Labour Movement. The condition of Indian workers, which it discloses, far from contradicting, confirms the earlier reports of Messrs. Johnstone and Sime and of Messrs. Purcell and Hallsworth and does it more authoritatively because all the three parties, namely Government, employers and workers were represented in the Commission.

There is another point in this connection which requires to be mentioned, namely my attitude as a Trade Unionist towards the Indian National Congress. Just after my arrest when I was wholly in the dark as to which of my activities could possibly bring me so far within the mischief of Section 121 A of I. P. C. as to induce a Magistrate at Meerut, which I had never visited, to issue a warrant against me, I was approached by some reporters for what is usually known as a 'message'. I told them that I knew nothing as to what all this was about and I asked my fellow workers to continue the same policy as we had been pursuing namely that the Indian National Congress and the All India Trade Union Congress—the two great sister organisations, should march hand in hand towards

our common goal, i. e. the political and economic emancipation of mother-land. These may not be the exact words, which would be available to the Court, if possible, in due course but that was the substance. This defines my attitude towards the National Congress. The Bengal Trade Union Federation presented an address to Mr. J. M. Sen Gupta on his being re-elected for the third time as the Mayor of Calcutta and took that occasion to define its attitude towards the Indian National Congress, and to state what organised Labour expects from the Municipal Corporation under the regime of the Congress. D 235 will indicate my acceptance of membership of the Labour Inquiry Sub Committee appointed by the Bengal Provincial Congress Committee. I have also referred on a previous occasion to the cooperation that I pleaded as necessary between the B. P. C. C. and the B. T. U. F. in the Conference of Labour representatives on the 2nd September 1928 in connection with the Trade Disputes Bill. The proceedings of the Federation (P 26) would show that the B. T. U. F. accepted the invitation of the Bengal Provincial Congress Committee to cooperate with it in the matter of the boycott of the Simon Commission decided upon by the A. I. T. U. C. at the Cawnpore Session. D 250 is an appeal to the delegates of the Indian National Congress at its Calcutta Session in 1928 as drafted by me in connection with the relief to the Bauria workers and subscribed to by Messrs. Mrinal Kanti Basu, M. Daud, Mr. Radha Raman Mitra and myself. There are some in the Labour Movement who are never so happy as when they could find an opportunity to condemn the Congress as a bourgeois body, as if when that is said nothing that need be said remains unsaid. While recognising that the policy of the Indian National Congress, by reason of the historical circumstances of which it is the product, is largely influenced by the needs and outlook of the middle class, yet from the very nature of things it can not be purely a capitalist body like the Federation of Chambers of Commerce or Mills-Owners Association on the one hand or a purely Labour body like the All India Trade Union Congress on the other. Moreover there is nothing in its constitution to prevent the representatives of either class to get into it and influence its policy. Further, between the capitalists and the workers there is a large section of the people who are not identified with either, and it is this class which, though unorganised, in the long run influences what is called public opinion, and it is to this section of people that both the classes address. A very large section of this class of people forms the permanent strength of the Indian National Congress. The reason why the capitalists or the employing class hitherto influenced Congress policy was because they were better organised and had greater resources. Now when Labour is being

steadily organised and it is in a position to voice its needs, the Indian National Congress also is developing a changed outlook. Pandit Moti Lal Nehru was quite right when in the report associated with his name he observed that in the not very distant future parties would be formed not on political or communal platforms but on the basis of economic needs and interests. I find in the Indian National Congress an organisation which steadily developing into a meeting ground of the employers and the workers, of the landlords and the tenants, where adjustment from time to time may be effected as far as possible of the conflicting interests of both—each such advance leading our people a step further towards the ultimate goal of socialism. The "fundamental rights" to which the Indian National Congress stands pledged is a great step forward in this direction.

The question of the fundamental rights in relation to the Indian National Congress and my attitude towards it brings me to a consideration of some evidence put in against me by the Prosecution, with exactly what purpose I have not been able to see clearly. One is a manuscript in my handwriting P 2510, recovered in the course of search of the office of the Workers' and Peasants' Party in Calcutta and the other is my membership of the Sub-Committee appointed at Cawnpore by the A. I. T. U. C. to draft a Labour constitution, as well as the evidence of P. W. 123 that I seconded the resolution moved by Dewan Chaman Lal at Jharia Session of the Congress for a Socialist Republic of India.

I have already said something in regard to P 2510, namely that it was a translation undertaken at the request of Mr. Muzaffar Ahmad of P. 1414 (B). According to the learned Magistrate the programme as contained in P 1414 (B) and P1414 (A), which was a manifesto of the Workers' and Peasants' Party to the Madras Session of the National Congress, was something agreement to which meant entering the conspiracy. At least that was his finding while dealing with Dr. Vishwa Nath Mukharji's case. I believe it is this finding of the learned Magistrate in regard to the terrible character of P. 1414 (B) which has made the Prosecution put in P 2510 at a very late stage of the case in this Court. I must say that the immediate demands, the economic demands and the social demands in P 1414 (B) are demands to which no Trade Unionist and Socialist can take exception, that most of these have been incorporated in the form of resolutions as demands of the All-India Trade Union Congress between the Sessions held in Madras 1926 and at Jharia in 1928, (I have not the reports of Sessions held earlier) and many of them have now been incorporated into the National Congress programme in the Karachi Session in 1931. If a

Labour or Socialist Party were formed in India to-day it is bound to incorporate practically all these demands into the programme it would have to issue. This programme is certainly not one of the reasons which kept me apart from the Workers' and Peasants' Party. The reasons I have already stated while explaining the character of my association with some of the accused who were members of the Party as well as my general relations with the Party, and I need not repeat them here. But when I translated this document I did so at the personal request of Mr. Muzaffar Ahmad with whom I had at the time no occasion to come into conflict in regard to Trade Union activities.

Now I come to deal with the Labour Constitution Subcommittee and with the resolution for the boycott of the Simon Commission to which this is a rider. If your Honour turn to D 232 which is a draft of a letter addressed by me to Mr. Hari Har Shastri, the Secretary Reception Committee, All-India Trade Union Congress, Cawnpore, you will find that therein I gave notice of two resolutions (sent with the letter) I intended to move at the 8th Session of the Congress. The second resolution, it may be noticed, dealing with the persons detained without trial, was carried without any hitch and will be found incorporated in the report of the Congress containing resolutions as finally passed at Cawnpore. But the first resolution gave rise to a considerable controversy, particularly as Mr. S. A. Dange brought in another resolution on the subject. Mr. Chaman Lal who was in the chair said that from what he could gather from the debates neither of the resolutions had the chance of being carried with an overwhelming majority as a resolution of this type ought to be, so he should like to suggest as a 'via media' a resolution which should have the support of practically the entire Executive Council. He asked me whether I would accept his draft and if I did whether I would have any objection to move it. I did consider this draft as an improvement on mine because of the reference in it to the principle of self-determination to which the British Labour Party stood pledged by virtue of its own resolutions passed and reaffirmed at its Annual Conferences. The rider to it was also a decided improvement because it indicated that the A. I. T. U. C. was not content with taking up a negative attitude towards the Simon Commission but considered that the time had come when organised labour should definitely have its goal defined in the form of a constitution. The names were put in by Mr. Chaman Lal in consultation with Mr. N. M. Joshi, the General Secretary, with a view to make it wholly representative. P. W. 119 who deposed to the proceedings of the A. I. T. U. C. at Cawnpore, was not wholly accurate when he said that resolution no: 2 (that is the Simon Boycott Resolution) was seconded by

Mr. Dange. It was not seconded by him but by Mr. M. Daud. Mr. Dange spoke in support of the resolution and gave his views as to how the boycott can be made a success—if the Congress earnestly sets about it—but he also opposed in the same speech the amendment brought in by Mr. Sethi asking the British Labour Party to withdraw their two representatives from the Statutory Commission— an amendment I accepted and the resolution with the amendment was carried. Mr. Dange, if he had seconded the resolution, could not have objected to an amendment which could not be brought unless a resolution duly moved and seconded was before the House. But while this witness said in cross-examination that Mr. Daud did not second the Simon Commission resolution, he did not consider it fit to put in the speech that myself and Dange delivered in this connection, though he admits that both of us spoke in English on the resolution. Mr. Dange's speech, if available, might have from the internal evidence given some indications whether it was in supporting or, in seconding the resolution that he was making the speech. Similarly, my speech, if available would have also given some indication of my views in connection with the Simon Commission. This witness said in cross-examination that the shorthand notes were destroyed after six months by the office, that is the Criminal Intelligence Department office to which he submitted them. All witnesses except this one when asked about the reports said they were ignorant what became of them after they had been submitted to the proper authorities. One witness, if I remember aright, deposed to a practice that the notes are destroyed after three years. In examination-in-chief he had explained that he was refreshing his memory from reports written by another reporter to his dictation, sometimes the same day and sometimes the next morning. These reports, he said, were correct and were based on shorthand notes taken by him and that the shorthand notes were destroyed in the 'ordinary course'. Not that the witness did not give any account of any speeches—alleged or otherwise. He quoted some remarks which he alleged were made by Mr. Jhabwala in connection with a resolution he moved. He also gave what purported to be a gist on what Dange was alleged to have said in connection with a resolution celebrating the 10th Anniversary of the United Socialist Soviet Republic. It was this reporter who made Dr. Vishwa Nath Mukherji say that the present Government "wanted to suck the Indians." But why should he omit to give a sample of what I said or what he thought I said or should have said in connection with the resolution is more than I can say. I emphasise on this omission as the learned Magistrate while dealing with my case has made a curious observation on page 278 in connection with Spratt's theses as convener of the Labour Constitution Sub - Committee :—"It must also be noted in connection

with the T. U. C. that he (1) was on sub-committee of nine, consisting of Spratt, Dange, Kishori Lal, Thengdi, Jhabwala and four others, to draft a constitution for India, (P. 545 (1)). Spratt drafted a pamphlet entitled "Labour and Swaraj" with a subsequent appendix on the Nehru constitution (P 78), which was circulated to all the members. There is nothing to show that the sub-committee accepted it; there is equally nothing to show that anyone criticised it—the reverse is implied. No one who reads this lucid pamphlet can fail to recognise its open communism; it is indeed one of the best and clearest expositions of the principles on which the conspiracy was working which is on the record. Kishori Lal's copy was found with him."

Apart from the logic that in the absence of adverse criticism on record acceptance by the sub-committee implied of a scheme drafted by the convener, I may point out that the learned Magistrate as usual did not carefully go through the Exhibit P. 78 which he himself cites. If he had done so he would have found the convener stating in para 2 of page 77 that he received only one or two comments on this suggestion and one of them was to the effect that the proposed statement was entirely one-sided, that is to say, it gave the view of only one party in the Trade Union Congress. Now, the learned Magistrate did not fail to recognise in what he calls 'this lucid pamphlet' its open Communism, and found that it was one of the best and clearest expositions of the principles on which the conspiracy was working. If this be so, how could the learned Magistrate take it that a sub-committee consisting of Messrs. N.M. Joshi, Chaman Lal, Daud, Sethi and R.B. Chandrika Parshad (the last was elected at the Executive meeting at Delhi as referred to in P. 78, page 78) would accept its open Communism simply because the learned Magistrate found no criticisms of the same? Then he states Kishori Lal's copy was found with him. I do not know what he wants to convey by it. I should think that as a member of the sub-committee it was quite natural for me to have a copy.

In this connection I may refer to P 2096P—put to me by your Honour—dated 16.1.28, purporting to have been written by Spratt to Muzaffar Ahmad in which it is stated: "A further circumstance adds to my embarrassment at the moment and that is that I am the convener of the sub-committee charged with formulating a constitution for India on behalf of the T.U.C. The National Congress, W.C. has now invited the T.U.C. to meet it in connection with this, and Mr. Joshi proposes that this Sub-committee should be the T.U.C. representative. I am in agreement but it means that I have to take a hand in formulating our suggestion. Kishori Lal, Daud and Sethi are on the Committee and I shall have to write to them in detail about it."

I did not receive the communication that was to be sent to me as referred to in the last three lines. As a matter of fact when in February 1928 Spratt told me at Delhi on the eve of the meeting of the Executive Council that he wanted to convene a meeting of the Constitution Sub-Committee as many of its members were present in connection with the E. C. meeting, I asked him whether he did any thing in regard to the drafting of it so that it might form the basis of discussion. He said that when he started for Delhi he had sent to the members per post a copy of the draft he made. As I did not get it he gave me a copy. But unfortunately the meeting of the Sub-Committee did not take place as the members could not go through the draft on so short a notice and the meeting of the Executive Committee Council kept us extremely busy. As a matter of fact it was perceived that unless there was a meeting and discussion amongst the members nothing could be done in regard to it. Unless some sort of agreement was arrived at on basic principles it was no use each drafting his own proposals. It was at Jharia when it was perceived that the A. I. T. U. C. must define its attitude in the All Parties Convention that was to shortly meet in Calcutta—it was then that Dewan Chaman Lal drafted a resolution after a hurried consultation with those amongst the members (of the constitution Sub-Committee) present there including myself, Spratt and Mr. Daud (who was presiding over the Session) and requested me to second it. The resolution as it emerged out of the consultation was as follows: (a) "This Congress formulates the following basis for the future constitution of India to be placed before the All Parties' Convention, to be held at Calcutta on the 22nd December 1928 and the subsequent days, as our demands; (1) Socialistic Republican Government of the working classes, (2) abolition of Indian States and Socialistic Government in those places, (3) Nationalisation of industries and land, (4) Universal adult franchise, (5) Free compulsory primary education, (6) Freedom of speech, (7) Right to work, maintenance and provision for social and unemployment insurance including maternity benefits, (8) non-enactment of repressive and reactionary labour legislation should be guaranteed, (9) Protection of Labour general interests.

(b) This Congress elects members of its Constitution Committee, one member from each affiliated union and Mr. R. R. Bakhale—the total not exceeding 50—as its delegate to the All Parties Convention to be held at Calcutta and instructs him to present the above programme to the Convention and take no further part in its proceedings if that programme is not accepted.

P. W. 123, was correct when he said in his examination-in-chief that a resolution about Socialistic Republic was seconded by

me, having been moved by Dewan Chaman Lal, but it seems that he got somewhat confused in his report, as he admitted on cross-examination that his report did not tally in certain respects with the official report D 305. He omitted certain items in his report of the resolution while he showed the last part of the resolution marked B as a part of Mr. Chaman Lal's speech. It must be a very imperfect sort of report if any part of the resolution is taken as a part of the mover's speech—particularly as the last part of the resolution, taking it for granted that the resolution as sometimes it is done was put before the House first, from its very nature can not be in any way the introductory observations of the speech. This witness was also not correct when he said that in seconding the resolution I did not make any speech. I did make a speech, and a very brief speech it was because throughout the proceedings I was suffering from what is called a clergyman's throat, which made me extremely hoarse and made speaking a considerable strain. I seconded the resolution because I considered time had come when the Trade Union Congress as the mouthpiece of organised labour should place before the nation its demands as well as its goal. The Indian National Congress at Madras had set the national goal the previous year as Independence, but that was a negative goal as it had said nothing as to what form of Government it wanted for the nation, supposing it attains its goal. The Trade Union Congress considers that goal to be Socialism. As under the auspices of the Congress the All Parties Convention would meet in Calcutta and different parties would place their viewpoint, it was quite in the fitness of things that a genuinely Socialistic programme should be also before the nation. It was this consideration also which made me support so strongly the election of Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru as President of the A. I. T. U. C. though I knew that his primary allegiance and duty were towards the Indian National Congress and that in case of conflict he would support the Indian National Congress rather than the Indian Trade Union Congress. But in the field of politics it was Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru alone amongst our prominent public men who was first to proclaim while founding the Independence League that the goal of India was a Socialistic Republic. The Trade Union Congress must necessarily have a programme to which the Indian National Congress as it is constituted cannot wholly subscribe. But at a time when the greatest common measure of unity was being sought for, the fit president for the A. I. T. U. C. was one holding a leading position in the National Congress and yet subscribing to a Socialist goal and programme. It was this idea which made me write in connection with the article on the Jharia Congress contributed to the Amrit Bazar Patrika in its issue of 30th December 1928: "If the Trade Union Congress opposes the Simon Commission or supports

the ideal of Independence it is because of its conviction that the former i. e. the Simon Commission can not do any substantial good to the Indian working class and that Independence is necessary for India because, even if India were given a Dominion Status which is not likely, India cannot have a Socialistic State as long as it remains within an Empire or Commonwealth of nations based on the individualistic State conception of Society." In other words if Parliameatarianism in England and the Dominions leads to Socialism India need not declare her Independence formally, she may be a part of the Federated Socialist & Cooperative Commonwealth.

The International Labour Office at Geneva.

There is another matter on which a word or two is necessary, that is my attitude towards the International Labour Office at Geneva. There are many interpellations which are from time to time put in the Assembly and the Council of State which prove that a very large section of the public does not think that India gets any benefit commensurate with the very large contribution Indians are called upon to make towards the upkeep of the League Office and of the I.L.O. But most of the Trade Unionists, and I am one of those who, while they do not have very great faith in the capacity of the I. L. O. from its very nature and constitution—of being of effective service to Indian Labour in the improvement of its working conditions, yet see in it an organisation through which publicity can be obtained amongst the workers of other parts of the world as regards the conditions of their comrades in this country. They also see in it an organisation which furnishes a meeting-ground of the Trade Union representatives of the various other countries, particularly of those where Labour has made great advance in the organisation of Trade Unions, as such of great educational value to those engaged in actual Trade Union activities in this country. Far from subscribing to those who are for damning the I. L. O. I was, because of these considerations, of opinion that the full quota of delegates and advisers permissible under the Treaty of Versailles should be sent by the Government. I moved an amendment to this effect at Jharia and recommended that if this was not given effect to, the A. I. T. U. C. should remain unrepresented, that is its delegates and advisers were directed not to attend the Conference. The Chairman through an unaccountable reason ruled it out of order. I myself was not at all eager to attend the Geneva Conference and had dissuaded Mr. Joshi at Cawnpore, who insisted on putting my name forward, from doing so, while at Jharia when my name was proposed at the Executive Council I induced the mover with the permission of the meeting and the Chairman to withdraw my name.

D/- 15. 8. 31

P. 28 is a letter from Mr. Dharni Kanti Goswami, the Secretary Scavengers' Union to me as the Secretary of the Federation dated 7th March 1928—forwarding to me a copy of the resolution passed in a mass meeting of the scavengers on the 5th March “and requesting me to take up the cause and bring out an honourable settlement.” Through the efforts of Mr. Mrinal Kanti Bose the President of the Federation and myself an honourable settlement was brought about.

D. 264 is the copy of the statement that Mr. J. M. Sen Gupta, the then Mayor, made at the meeting of the Corporation on the 9th March and sets out the terms of the settlement. The Mayor was also kind enough to thank the President and the Secretary of the Federation in the course of his statement for helping him in the calling off of the strike.

P 29 is the copy of a letter addressed to the Secretary Council of Action by Mr. Dharni Kanta Goswami, the Secretary of the Scavengers' Union of Bengal dated the 12th February 1928 and sent to me for information as I was also a member of this Council. The resolution forming the Council of Action was moved by Mr. Chaman Lal from the chair and carried unanimously at the Cawnpore Session of the A. I. T. U. C., and I was elected one of the members from Bengal.

P. 37 is a leaflet which was distributed to the members of the Executive Council at its meeting at Delhi in February 1928. As regards the question of affiliation to International bodies I have already made my position clear.

P. 34 has already been dealt with at some length in connection with strikes. It is the report of a meeting of the Central Executive Council of the Bengal Jute Workers' Association held on 3rd January 1929.

P36 is an appeal I addressed to the Jamshedpur workers as the Secretary to the Inquiry Committee appointed by Mr. N.M. Joshi, the General Secretary with the approval of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, the President, in pursuance of the resolution passed at the Jharia Session of the A.I.T.U.C. It was this “literary effort” of mine which was of interest to the learned Magistrate because of such words and phrases as ‘Solidarity’ and ‘Workers of the world unite.’ At the very outset of the statement I pointed out that the learned Magistrate was wrong in holding that in my statement before him I admitted that I was inspired by the ‘Inprecorr’ in making use of these expressions. Mr. Brailsford, examined by me,

admitted that the passage shown to him on page 43 of D 544 is the economic basis of the slogan "Workers of the world unite." He further said that the unions composing the Second International subscribed to those principles unanimously. "The same principles" he continued, "were preached by K.L. Ghosh in the first eleven lines of his speech as reported in D 176." I have very little to add to what I stated at the Inquiry Court in regard to P.36. D 208 (4), D 208 (5), D 209 (1), D 209 (2) and D 209 (3) will confirm my statement in the Lower Court and in this Court and explain the circumstances in which the appeal was issued.

P 544 (3):— I have already dealt with this document on a previous occasion and have nothing to add to what I have stated.

P 26:— Proceedings of the Bengal Trade Union Federation. I have had to refer to it on many occasions in the course of my statement and have shown how some very material and relevant facts which could be ascertained by reference to it have not been placed before the Court.

P 545 (5):— These seem to have been taken out of a file which Spratt must have kept as the convener of the Labour Constitution Sub-Committee. I have nothing to add to what I have already said in connection with this Sub-Committee. Many of the documents in this series seem to be duplicates or drafts of P.78.

In concluding my explanations about my activities as the Secretary of the Bengal Provincial Committee it is in the fitness of things that I should make a few observations as to what I understand by Trade Unionism and what is the goal of a Trade Unionist. In my statement before the Inquiry Magistrate I claimed that all my activities in the organisation of Labour were those of a genuine Trade Unionist. Since that time we have heard much about genuine Trade Unionism. The Prosecution in their summing up in the Lower Court with a great show of fairness stated, as the learned Magistrate puts it, that "any of the accused who may be found to be a genuine Trade Unionist and not a Communist conspirator should be discharged." But from the summing up itself as well as the way in which evidence was led it appears that the Prosecution have not cared to acquaint themselves with the actual connotation of the term and the history of the movement called by this name. At any rate, as the Prosecution did not anywhere attempt any definition of the term or anything like an exposition of the ideas which one has come to associate with Trade Unionism, we are positively left in the dark as to what they meant by that statement which the learned Magistrate considered very 'fair.' But what the Prosecution left undone the learned Magistrate attempted to

do. He did so with a view to refute "the allegation" and remove "the misconception" that the case is an attack upon Trade Unionism. This is what he says: "A definition of the term 'genuine Trade Unionist' is perhaps difficult. In my opinion a 'genuine Trade Unionist' is one who is primarily concerned with the improvement of the existing conditions of the workers with which his Union is concerned; he is connected with politics only in so far as he aims at getting legislation for such improvement; he creates strikes for the same object." Then he gives the motives with which according to him a Communist takes part in the Trade Union Movement. This definition of the learned Magistrate, I submit, is not a correct one. It has unduly restricted the scope of activities of the Trade Unionists and has given only the activities required at the very preliminary stage of the movement as his only and sole concern. If, according to the learned Magistrate, this was the first and last word on Trade Unionism, I submit that the efforts of the Magistrate have resulted in a caricature and not in a true picture of a Trade Unionist, a much maligned being. I wonder how the veteran Trade Union leaders like Henderson, Thomas, Tom Shaw and Clynes (I drop their prefixes of 'Rt. Honourable' not in disrespect or for want of courtesy to the members of His Majesty's Government, but for the moment I am emphasising their prominent association with the great movement which raised them to their present exalted rank)—I wonder how these Trade Unionists, if they happened to have a look at the Committal Order, would regard this attempt at a definition of a genuine Trade Unionist. Historical conditions have made Great Britain the original home of genuine Trade Unionism, with long and well-established traditions. I shall therefore quote, as some before me have done, from the History of Trade Unionism by Sydney and Beatrice Webb—the former now raised to the peerage and known as Lord Passfield—to see what a Trade Union is. "A Trade Union.....is a continuous association of wage-earners for the purpose of maintaining or improving the conditions of their working life." Now in view of the sinister meaning sought to be attached by the Prosecution to any reference to class or class-consciousness I must say that this definition indicates that Trade Unions are primarily class organisations which owe their origin and development to the class-consciousness of the workers, that is when workers become alive to the necessity of protecting or safe-guarding their interests as a class. As their organisations grow and as they gain experience, their outlooks are broadened and they begin to have a clearer conception of the structure of society and the need for altering it with a view to put an end to this existence of classes with opposing interests. A Trade Unionist, therefore, cannot but be a Socialist whose

ultimate aim is to bring about a system which by the control of the means of production, distribution and exchange would do away with inequalities and give everyone the same facilities for bringing out the best that is in him. I have said enough in the course of my statement intended to convey the idea of what genuine Trade Unionism is. I shall quote only two passages in order to show that even the British Trade Union Congress has a wider outlook of the duties and ideals of a Trade Unionist than what the Magistrate lays down for them. In 1924 at the 56th Annual Session of the British Trade Union Congress Mr. A. Purcell said in the course of his Presidential Address:—Our aim is not merely to build up big unions but to create an instrument of solidarity capable of changing the existing structure of capitalist society and bringing into being a Workers' State which will guarantee to all who are ready and willing to render service, a place and opportunity and a life free from the horrors of poverty ignorance, insecurity and disease. Mr. Arthur Pugh in the course of his Presidential address at the 58th Session of the British Trade Union Congress in 1926 asks:—“Is it anti-social to seek to inspire the workers with a true sense of their value in the economic life of the country, to develop their capacity to exercise functions in the control of industry, even if it means the supersession of a system based upon the principle of “every man for himself and devil takes the hindmost”, by one of organised national control and cooperative efforts?” So a genuine Trade Unionism on the one hand does not accept the very restricted scope allowed to it by the learned Magistrate nor on the other hand it accepts the limitation sought to be imposed on it by the Communists, to whom a Trade Union to fulfil its true function must be a revolutionary organisation pledged to help the revolution if not to bring it about. A genuine Trade Unionist is fully alive to the realities of the situation, knows the surroundings in which he is to work. To him even a strike is a painful necessity involving starvation and distress, and so he explores all possible means for a settlement before he advocates or endorses this action. He takes part in politics so that he may bring in legislation for the betterment of the working class, but he knows that unless and until the means of production, distribution and exchange are socialised and absolute equality of opportunity is provided for all, all the avoidable miseries of the hard-working and ill-paid producers of industrial wealth will not be at an end. So he attempts through the process of collective bargaining, with strike as an ultimate sanction, to effect as much improvement as possible in the present wretched conditions of the workers. He knows that each time some improvement is effected either through bargaining with the employers or through Legislation as a result of the awakening of social conscience or public opinion by means of publicity or propaganda, it means a

step further to the desired goal. But as success in bringing about even these small initial improvements depends on the extent of organised support that he can secure his whole attention is devoted to the task of organisation.

Q. The following are documents etc. which were recovered in your search and which may be regarded as evidence of Connection: P. 21, 22, 31, 32, 33, 39, 48, 49, 54, 55, 57 to 67, and 87 to 91. Have you anything to say about these ?

A. The literature recovered by P. W. 109 during a search of my house may be classified under three headings—books, periodicals and political pamphlets or leaflets. I have already stated what I had got to state in regard to those from the last category which were put in as evidence against me. The books were on various subjects, as will be found by a reference to the search^{list} which includes such well-known books as Shakespeare's "Midsummer's Night's Dream" or some of Scott's works and even a Bengali book entitled Savitri Charit, which in verse narrates the story of Savitri—the symbol of chastity as told in the Mahabharat. I am referring to this to show the thorough character of the search by the Police aided by C. I. D. officers of the Special Branch, who, as the learned Magistrate compliments the prosecution, left nothing to chance and took no risks. Out of about thirty books—big and small—the Prosecution have put in only nine, with a view to show, I presume, that I took some interest in Communism. Apparently the learned Magistrate thought so, in spite of my explanation that I had to read such books as a journalist and that if the quarters of the editors of the Statesman were searched, many such books would be found. Perhaps what is allowable in the case of those who are intellectual directors of the 'Statesman' otherwise known as 'the friend of India' may become sinister and suspicious in the case of the Assistant Editor of Amrit Bazar Patrika who also happens to be a Trade Unionist engaged in the task of organising Labour. Referring to Stalin's "Leninism," "Russia's Path to Communism," by Zinovief, "Ten days that shook the World by Raid," "Lenin as Marxist," by Bukharin, and "The Revolutionary Movement in the Colonies"—the learned Magistrate seems to have been struck with the "selection" and remarked that this is a selection which required more explanation than what I had given. The explanation about "The Revolutionary Movement in the Colonies" was attached to the book itself which unfortunately escaped the Magistrate as it did those who were responsible for printing the exhibits. I refer the Court to the evidence of P.W.109 who identified P 90 (E) and admitted on cross-examination by me that this envelope addressed to the Secretary Press Employees'

Association I, Kantapukar Lane, Calcutta, was found inside the book, and you put in a note to the effect that P.90 (E) was brought on the record to save printing as it was omitted in the Lower Court.

With regard to the "selection" which appeared so striking to the learned Magistrate I beg to state that in order to have a correct idea as to what Leninism is I certainly prefer to invest my money in books written either by Lenin himself or by those who were the best known lieutenants of this much hated and much revered historic figure and are now carrying on what they consider to be the good work begun by their beloved master. Now the best known-practical exponent in the world today of Leninism is certainly Stalin who has not only been successful in ousting Trotsky from Russian political life but is claimed by the Stalinists to be one of the fathers—if not the father of the famous Five Years' Plan, said to be the logical corollary of Lenin's New Economic Policy. A journalist worth his salt—not to speak of a Trade Unionist—who to take note of the International currents of thoughts and ideas in the Labour Movement of the world, I submit, can not fail to be interested in the authoritative exposition of an ideology which now influences the practical policy of one of the greatest States in the world.

These books were all available in the reputable book-selling firms, were advertised in newspapers and as D 281 shows, openly sold. "Ten days that shook the world" was similarly purchased only a week before my arrest as the date on the inside cover would show. "Soviet Year Book" was an earlier purchase, and to me the name of R. Palme Dutt, the compiler, counted less than the fact that at the time it was purchased it was, as far as I knew, the only authoritative book of reference on Soviet Russia. I believe that the character of the book did not escape the attention of the learned Magistrate as he did not include it in the list of the books, the selection of which to his mind required explanation. The learned Magistrate also did not include in the selection the Communist Manifesto (P21) and a booklet on Imperialism by Emile Burns—the last along with two others, namely "Study of Marxism" and "Trade Unionism", recovered in my search was not put in as an exhibit—was also purchased from the same bookshop from which "Ten days that shook the world" was purchased.

In dealing with my individual case the learned Magistrate was rather perturbed at the selection of half a dozen or so of Communist books recovered from my possession. But he might have applied to my case the general principle he himself laid down on page 282: "The fact that a certain accused had a large amount of Communist literature in his possession is a significant

facts but its exact evidentiary value depends on other considerations . . . what proportion this bears to the other literature which he had, what legitimate reasons there may be for their presence." Amongst legitimate reasons he mentions two, namely, that "A journalist might be sent books on Communism for review, or a student of economics might have some books on Communism among other books on political science or political economy." I hope for the sake of commonsense that the learned Magistrate intended to make the list of legitimate reasons as indicative rather than exhaustive, otherwise the position would be intolerable if any our intellectual pursuits were to be guided by the tastes, proclivities and prejudices of the Magistrate. I do submit that a journalist, as also a Trade Unionist, and I may go further and say that every educated citizen who concerns himself in public affairs has a right to study Communism or any other 'ism' with which the world is blessed or cursed from time to time—if only to see what is there in it, which challenges the established notions and ideals of the world. I may refer in this connection to the evidence of P. W. 109 who said in cross-examination that I had approximately five hundred books in my house up and down stairs on different subjects. If the learned Magistrate was struck with the selection of Communist books I may say here that Mr. Gordon, the Deputy Commissioner of Police was rather surprised at the collection because of the variety of subjects it comprised. I also refer in this connection to P. W. 104 Mr. Suresh Chandra Majumdar, the Managing Director of one of the most influential papers of Calcutta called the Anand Bazar Patrika.

Now Sir, I come to the second class namely the periodicals like Labour Monthly, Inprecorr, Masses of India and Vanguard. I stated in the Lower Court that some copies of the Inprecorr etc. managed to get through to the office of the Amrit Bazar Patrika and I took some home with me and sometimes returned them and sometimes kept them. The learned Magistrate found that the issues possessed by me are very old and probably my explanation in respect of them is correct. But he adds:

"Though even he fails to account for the interest which induced him take them" when he made this remark he had not in mind the fact which he himself notes on page 282 when he says: "And of course the police were concerned with only one type of literature the search lists say only what was seized and not what was left behind." If the search lists state what was left behind the learned Magistrate's suspicion would have been set at rest because quite a number of the issues of the "Daily Herald," "Lansbury's Weekly" (now defunct), "London Daily Mail,"

"Daily Telegraph" etc. were lying scattered about. The fact is that journalists who have to work at home are generally sent by the office these papers or they bring themselves, and barring those papers of which files are kept at the office—nobody cares what becomes of them. Most of them are sent to the office but still quite a number of them are often left forgotten. Sometimes an interesting cutting is kept or a particular issue is preserved if it contains anything that may be necessary for future reference. It is not possible for me at this distance of time to say which of these periodicals were preserved and which of them were simply suffered to remain. But by going through the contents of some I can say why I preserved them. P 31 for example is an issue of the Masses of India of September—October 1927 containing an attack on Mr. Joshi, that is Mr. N. M. Joshi, and also an attack on Mr. Bipin Chandra Pal who was the Chairman of the Reception Committee of the all India Press Employees Conference of which I was the Secretary. P 33 is the Vanguard of September 1, 1922 which under the heading "Missed the point" criticises an editorial note written by me in the Amrit Bazar Patrika. P 54 International Press Correspondence dated 12th April 1923 contains an article on "the Strategy and Tactics of the Russian Communist Party" by Stalin, who was just being referred to by the British papers as one of the most active Lieutenants of Lenin. This issue also contains another article which interested me very much. This article is headed "American Democracy on Trial" and gives an account of the Trial of some American Communists. I may mention here that by a curious coincidence on the day previous to my arrest I had just finished the reading of a book called "Boston", by Upton Sinclair, which gives a detailed account of the Trial of Sacco and Vanzetti which has come in for prominent mention at the hands of the late Mr. Langford James in his Opening Address.

P 60, Inprecorr dated 8th August 1922, contains the views of Romain Rolland on the Communist Party. The eminent French idealist says "I never desired to belong to this Party nor to any party. There is no place in it for a free man." It also contains an article on the Revision of German Indemnity and International Indebtedness, a subject of great interest to journalists at the time when the question of Indemnity was being freely discussed in the Indian press. It also contained an article on 'May Day as viewed by the Communists', and on page 284 an article on 'Political Prisoners in India' by Evelyn Roy.

P 63 "The Labour Monthly" August 1927 containing an article entitled "Isolation of India" by Bernard Houghten, a retired member of the I. C. S., a regular contributor to the Indian Nationalist press.

P 64 Vanguard of June, 1922, several interesting notes and articles including one on Bengal Trade Union Congress—others on New Economic Policy in Russia which was very much discussed in the British press at the time, and on Indian National Congress by Mr. M. N. Roy who is now alleged to be at Cawnpore awaiting his trial.

I have tried to project my mind in the past and give an idea as to why these issues were kept. There were various other periodicals including some old issues of Socialist Weekly, sometime edited by Mr. MacDonald, which were as I have said kept because of the contents of some articles which I found interesting and at the time considered might be useful for reference. By interest in a subject a journalist means the desire to study it in all its aspects, to master the arguments for and against it. I am forced to go into this matter, though obvious on the face of it, because it was left for the learned Junior Public Prosecutor, a Cambridge Graduate, to enunciate the novel theory that interest in subjects other than what the police considered safe is by itself suspicious and my explanation he was pleased to call "fantastic."

I shall now refer to certain entries in the diary found in my search and put in by the Prosecution against me and mentioned by the Magistrate while dealing with my individual case. He finds the addresses in my notebook of Kedar Nath Sahgal and M. A. Majid, the Indian Seamen's Union and Someyendra Nath Tagore as significant, in fact more significant than my association with Johnstone and Ryan. I have already stated the character of my association with Mr. Tagore. With regard to Messrs. Sahgal and Majid I may say that I met them at Cawnpore in connection with the Trade Union Congress, and they were introduced to me by Mr. Chaman Lal the President of the Cawnpore Session of the Congress. Mr. Sahgal was kind enough to hand over a card to me which I put in my diary and it stayed there. I noted down Mr. Majid's address because he was introduced to me as the Secretary of the Punjab Press Workers' Association and being myself connected with a Press Union I wanted to keep myself in touch with the Press Unions in other provinces. I do not remember how I got the address of the Indian Seamen's Union. It may have been copied out of the bound set of Langa presented to me by Mr. Muzaffar Ahmad or it might have been supplied to me by Mr. Daud who as the President and at first as the General Secretary of the Indian Seamen's Union in Calcutta must have had some connection with this Union in London. I personally had no correspondence with this Body but I must have kept the address with a view to correspond with it if I ever, as the Secretary of the B. T. U. F., wanted some information

about the Indian Laskars in London. There is also mention by the learned Magistrate of some entries in my diary of Communist and marxist books. I have a habit of putting down the names of books which I want to read or buy, and if the learned Magistrate had turned over the pages of the diary he would have found also a complete list of the books of Mr. H. G. Wells and Upton Sinclair. Then there is mention of P 47. Only one entry, in one of the pages meant for memo, has been given and only one item namely "to see Jhabwala" has been printed in the exhibit. Now what is actually on the diary is like this: The date 5-4-26 is given, then is written "to see Rai Sahab. Chandrika Parshad, to inquire about the Agent of G. I. P., to see S. A. Brelvi Meadows Street, to see Ginwalla, to see Jhabwala" and finally "to see Joshi." This is clearly a list of engagements of which that with Mr. Jhabwala was one. On the 6th January 1926 the name of Mr. Muzaffar Ahmad as Editor Ganavani has been entered. This should not be taken to be as an indication that I was acquainted with him at the time. As a matter of fact it was not till after Campbell was bailed out that I came to know him and that was considerably later than 6th January 1926. This address as also the address of another gentleman just above him were entered here at a considerably later period than the date actually indicates. It may be that this diary was lying at hand or by mistake I entered here what I should have done in another. The difference of ink and pen between the several entries on the same date might lend some confirmation to what I say.

P 82 (T) is a letter dated 25th May 1928 addressed to me by Mr. Muzaffar Ahmad. This exhibit was not put to me but I came across it while going through my notes about some of the exhibits that I made. In this letter I am requested to publish in the Amrit Bazar Patrika the notice of a meeting of the Scavengers' Union and also to attend a meeting with Mr. Mrinal Kanti Bose, "when you come to the meeting I shall hand over the money to you there" refers to a private loan I advanced to Mr. Muzaffar Ahmad.

I should like to have on record my readiness to answer any question that may be put by your Honour or by the Prosecution through the Court and as none has been put I shall conclude with a few remarks about the case.

I have not much to say about the case and perhaps this is not the time to say it. I have tried to analyse at least the character of the evidence as against me as occasion demanded in the course of the statement I made. I shall here only point out some of the striking features which would make it a landmark in the history of Trade Unionism in our country. The British workers had to

fight the law which for many years penalised the Trade Union activities as conspiracy in restraint of trade. British workers had for a long time to fight what Mr. Sydney Webb would call the class prejudice of the courts in the interpretation of the legislation removing some of the disabilities on the Trade Unions as corporate bodies. The American workers have been now fighting what is known as the Law of Injunction, which is so all embracing that during a strike, on the motion of the employers, the workers can be prohibited from doing anything, as one writer observed, except "to eat air and walk on their head." But it was left for the resourceful Government of India to indite Trade Union activities as being a conspiracy to deprive the king of his sovereignty. Such words as 'solidarity,' 'class-consciousness,' 'fraternally' and 'comrade' have been given a sinister meaning; association in perfectly lawful activities in due discharge of duties pertaining to the offices, attached to public organisations—activities which the Prosecution protests are not being sought to be penalised—has been taken as evidence of agreement. Accused making long statements to make their position clear have been criticised as making unnecessary long statements with a view to prolong the duration of the case. But nothing is said about the very large number of unnecessary documents produced by the Prosecution at the Inquiry Court only to be dropped at the Trial Court.

In no case, as far as I know, in this country was so much attention given by the Government to securing the widest publicity for the Opening Address of the Prosecution. The Director of Information himself came to Meerut when the enquiry had just begun to see that proper arrangements were made for the widest publicity for the Opening Address of the late Mr. Langford James. Nowhere in the Criminal Procedure Code is there any provision for an Opening Address by the public prosecutor at the Inquiry Court, but still the Opening Address was delivered from beginning to end it was a sustained propaganda. That famous Forensic treat summarised in the description of all the accused as 'anti-God and anti-family and anti-everything' would not be very easily forgotten by those who are actively connected with the Trade Union Movement in this country. But propaganda is not stopped here. Leaflets are issued from Whitehall itself shifting the responsibility of the present Labour Government in connection with this case. It is said that the policy which was responsible for the case being instituted was not the policy of the present incumbants of office but their predecessors. The present Government, it is said, had no option but to allow the law to take its course. We have not been allowed a Jury Trial, we have been told, because these are matters of procedure or governed by the Criminal Procedure Code and

the Criminal Procedure Code does not allow a Jury. But discreet silence is maintained over the fact that section 527 of the same Criminal Procedure Code does give the Governor-General in Council power to transfer a case from one province to another "whenever it appears to him that such transfers will promote the ends of justice or tend to the general convenience of Parties or witness." Discreet silence is maintained over the fact that the Governor-General in Council was applied to at a very early stage of the proceedings but could not see his way to grant the application. If ever there was a case which justified transfer from one province to another for the ends of the justice or for the convenience of parties or witnesses it was this case. Most of the accused in this case were arrested either from Calcutta or Bombay which two cities were the scene of most of their activities and from which two cities the largest number of witnesses were brought to Meerut which is at least a thousand miles away from either of them.

But the greatest tragedy of all is this that all this should happen under a Labour Government and that a case of this magnitude should have a life as long perhaps as this Government will live a case in which the bulk of the evidence relates to Trade Union activities while the present Government is composed of a number of leading Trade Unionists. It remains to be seen whether Trade Unionism is on Trial or the Trade Unionist members of the British Cabinet are on Trial.

Q. What about your Defence witnesses ?

A. I will let the Court have the revised list later.

Sd. R. L. Yorke.

Q. You have now read over your statement several times and it has been corrected and amended as and where requested by you. Are you now satisfied that the above record is correct ?

A. Yes.

Sd. Kishori Lal Ghosh

Sd. R. L. Yorke.

1-10-31.

1-10-31.

Certified that the above is a full and true account of accused's statement taken down by steno-graphers in my presence and hearing and subsequently transcribed by them and corrected and amended as and where requested by the accused and admitted by him to be correct.

Sd. R. L. Yorke.

1-10-31.

Saraswati Machine Printing Press, Meerut, U. P. (India).

Meerut. In the Court of R. L. Yorke. I. C. S. Addl. Sessions Judge

In the case of King—Emperor versus P. Spratt and other Examination of Gangadhar Moreshwar Adhikari accused under section 312 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1898, made before me R. L. Yorke, A. S. J., at Meerut on the 19th day of September 1931.

My name is Gangadhar Moreshwar Adhikari; my father's name is Moreshwar Adhikari; I am by caste Nil; 31 years of age; by occupation physico-chemist; my home is at Bombay, Police-station unknown; district Bombay, I reside at Bombay.

Q. Is your statement P 2611 of the Lower Court which was read over to you on 16th March 1931 correct?

A. Yes.

Q. The following is the evidence which has been tendered against you arranged as far as possible in chronological order: P 1357, 1484, 1169, 1485, 1479, 1811, 1657, 870, 1477, 1478, 1488 1683C, 1295, 1373 (1), 1353, 1343, 1825, 1512, 1690, 1261, 1196, 1674P, 1344, 1170, 1345, 949, 1676, 1174, 1297, 1171, 1172, 1173, 1163, 1164, 1165, 311, 1168, 1194, 1195 and statements of a number of witnesses including P. W. 274 with P. 2529. Have you anything to say in explanation of the facts in evidence against you?

A. Before I proceed to explanations of the exhibits and the evidence filed against me I should like to make a few observations by way of introduction. I have said that I am by profession a physico-chemist. Now we have found by experience in this case that every word which is uncommon and beyond the comprehension of the Prosecution and the Court is generally misunderstood and construed as a mystical code. I may therefore as well assure the Court and the Prosecution that such a species of chemist as physico-chemist does exist. In the firm in which I was employed up to the time of my leaving Germany I was working as a physico-chemist and I am described as such in the contract that I had with that firm. I do not deem it worth while to produce that document before this Court although I have it in my possession. I am here before the Court not as a physico-chemist but as a Communist. I am charged of having conspired to deprive the King Emperor of his sovereignty over British India. I am supposed to have done this conspiring during the hundred days of freedom which I enjoyed in this country on my return to it after more than 6 years of absence. How did I

conspire? The entire evidence filed against me boils down to the following 'overt acts'. They are:—

- (1) I arrived in India with Marxist and Leninist books in my possession.
- (2) I joined the Workers' and Peasants' Party in Bombay.
- (3) I became a member of the Communist Party of India.
- (4) I was present and spoke at the Lenin Day meeting in 1929.
- (5) I wrote three articles, which are not at all seditious even in the eyes of the Indian Penal Code which appear under my name in a Weekly called the 'Spark'.

For these so-called 'overt acts' I am charged under section 121 A. I. P. C. and threatened with transportation for life. I admit having committed these acts, but what do they all amount to? Holding of Communist opinions, being a member of a political party which had a Communist programme namely the C. P. I., participating in a meeting in honour of Lenin, the founder of the Communist International, possessing a collection of books on Communism, Marxism and Leninism: that is all. Is that 'high treason'? Is that conspiracy? Yes, in India it is so. The section 121 A seems to provide for it. In his opening speech, the late Mr. Langford James told the Court that it was not necessary for him to prove any single 'overt act.' Under the section 121 A, the mere agreement consequent on being members of a Communist Party was quite enough. If the interpretation of Mr. Langford James were correct, then there would be no defence for those who admit being members of the Communist Party. However this is not the stage to discuss the legal aspect of the question.

What I want to stress is this, that the 'overt acts' committed by me amount to nothing more than the holding of political opinions, expressing them in public on one occasion, and finally being a member of a political party which stands committed to a programme of the overthrow of Imperialism and Capitalism in India. Still for these acts which are not illegal in themselves even under the ordinary law as it exists today in India I am charged with high treason, deprived of my liberty for nearly three years, and threatened with transportation for life.

This is therefore clearly a case of prosecution, nay persecution, for holding and disseminating political opinions. Our crime even according to a learned Judge of the Allahabad High Court is, "to hold meetings, to study principles of Communism and probably

also to make an attempt to disseminate these teachings, which are said to be dangerous to society and dangerous to the sovereignty of His Majesty." I know that your Honour in the very learned order on our bail applications has disagreed with this view but I shall come to that later. Now granting that the principles we hold are dangerous to society (which as I shall show is an absurd position) I contend that the prosecution of persons for disseminating such principles is a plain denial of the freedom of opinion. Professor H. J. Laski, a bourgeois thinker, holds the following view about the dissemination of "dangerous ideas" and the attitude of law towards it. In his book "Liberty in the Modern State", he says, "If an English Communist leader writes a book or a pamphlet, whatever be its substance and to whomsoever it is addressed, I do not think the law ought to be used against him. For it is the history of these matters that if Government once begin to prohibit men from seeking to prove in writing that violent revolution is desirable, they will, sooner or later, prohibit them from saying that the social order they represent is not divine."

Bourgeois liberalism therefore maintains that the prohibition of the dissemination of ideas dangerous to the sovereignty of His Majesty would mean a lapse into feudal absolutism.

India is under the absolutist rule of the feudal—Imperialist State. In India the question of the right of disseminating ideas dangerous to the sovereignty does not arise. Even for the two learned Judges of the High Court, who spread panic in the Simla circles by taking a milder view of the present conspiracy, the question of this right did not arise. It was quite self-evident to them that if the accused have attempted to disseminate such dangerous ideas they ought to be sentenced, if not for transportation for life then for something less. Thus I have the authority of the Hon'ble Judges of the Allahabad High Court to back me, when I say that we are being prosecuted and will be ultimately sentenced for holding and disseminating political opinions.

Now, your Honour in your weighty order has disagreed with their Lordships in the view they have taken of the conspiracy. You think that "disseminating of opinions" and "promulgating of opinions" are inadequate descriptions of the acts we have committed, namely the formation of the Communist Party. Further according to your Honour the alleged connection of the C. P. I. with the Communist International is also a serious matter. Thus according to your Honour, the present case is a prosecution of persons for organising a political party which openly and avowedly stands for the revolutionary overthrow of the present order in India. Now in

the advanced bourgeois countries, with what are known as 'democratic traditions', the right of organising a political party which seeks to win over the people to the view of the desirability of bringing about by force a change in the existing social order is conceded, at least in normal times, and under ordinary law. The preliminary work of such a Party would be in the main, the propaganda and agitation of the revolutionary principles among the masses, and the organisation of persons who have come to accept these ideas in a body which is to be the instrument of carrying out these principles into practice. The right to organise such a party reduces itself in the main therefore to the right to unfettered freedom of disseminating and promulgating revolutionary ideas. This unfettered freedom, it would be argued, would bring disorder, hence it should not exist in a modern state. It would therefore follow that the right to organise a political party, with a programme which is dangerous to sovereignty, and dangerous to the present order, should not be allowed. However, this is neither the theory nor the practice even in bourgeois countries under normal times. We know that Communist parties exist openly in many countries of Europe and openly participate in normal political life and struggle there. Professor H. J. Laski in the book quoted above writes in defence of such unfettered freedom and disposes of the objection about disorder in the following manner. He says, "If views moreover which imply disorder are able to disturb the foundations of the State, there is some thing supremely wrong with the governance of that State. For disorder is not a habit of mankind. We cling so eagerly to our accustomed ways, that as even Burke insists, popular violence is always an outcome of a deep popular wrong."

This is a liberal bourgeois view. It amounts to this. The right of organising a political party which aims and works for the violent overthrow of the present order of society must be conceded. This cannot lead to disorder and chaos, for the most simple reason that if the Party succeeds in getting popular adherence, in bringing about a popular revolution, then it is evident that the present order was rotten and deserved to be overthrown. If on the other hand the Party fails to get popular adherence then it causes no disorder. "The New Statesman and the Nation" which is undoubtedly a Liberal bourgeois paper expresses views on the present Case which I am sure your Honour will not appreciate. It is nevertheless worth while quoting a passage from an article on the "Meerut Conspiracy Case" which appeared in the issue of 8th August 1931. The writer of the article "gathers from the Committal Order that the Government of India exercised great forbearance in not adding most of the present Cabinet, to the list of those who are supposed to have assisted in the conspiracy". "As for Mr. Lansbury", he adds, "he seems

to have been the President of the League against Imperialism when he was actually engaged in the conspiracy". He concludes from this that "an alien Government cannot afford to be strictly logical. About half India is engaged in a conspiracy to change the Government. It would be possible, and a learned Judge has said that it would be correct, to indict not only the whole Congress Party, but also both Hindu and Muslim Liberals for an offence under the same section of the Penal Code under which the Meerut prisoners are charged. A conspiracy to overturn the Government is about the only activity open to Nationalist politicians in a country under foreign control".

The representatives of the bourgeoisie, who rule over India, do not and will not recognise this logic advanced by a liberal spokesman of their own class. Even such liberties which obtain under bourgeois rule in capitalist countries of Europe are not to be wasted on a subject colonial people. The British bourgeois rule in India is of a feudal-absolutist character which allows no freedom of opinion and no freedom of organisation. This case is an attack on the right of the working class to organise their political party, which stands and works for the Independence of India from British Imperialism through revolution, and for the establishment of an Indian Federal Workers' and Peasants' Soviet Republic.

You will say that this is a most surprising plea. I can quite understand. How can a God's own Englishman grant even for a moment the right of existence to a political party which openly and avowedly stands for the forcible overthrow of British rule and for the establishment of a Federation of Soviet Republics on the soil of his Majesty's own British India? But I may remind your Honour that even the world of bourgeois ideas is somewhat broader than the chambers of a Meerut Civilian Club with its Whisky and Soda, Havana cigars and Race Course atmosphere. As I have said, the Communist Parties with similar programmes have the rights of existence in advanced bourgeois countries like England, France, America, Germany, etc. Nobody would think of denying these Parties the right of existence in principle at least in normal times in those countries. Not that the bourgeoisie in those countries have developed special love for the Communist Parties, but the right of organising a political party, whatever its principles and programme, has become one of the accepted rights under bourgeois democracy. There would be quite a popular clamour in which liberal bourgeois circles may join if the Government in Britain were to take steps which would jeopardise the right to organise a political party on the ground that it stood for a revolutionary change in the existing

social order. The right to organise a political party, whatever its aims and methods may be, is inherent under bourgeois democracy. In fact it is used by the bourgeoisie themselves to cloud and confuse the class character of the political struggle by creating a veritable maze of political parties. So there is nothing so preposterous in the proposition that the act of organising a Communist Party with the said aim is not a crime but merely the exercise of a right.

You may search through the whole file of the evidence and exhibits filed in this case and fail to lay your finger upon a single overt criminal act. Mr. Kemp himself was, I understand, in quite an embarrassing position when asked to point out to specific overt criminal acts in this conspiracy by the Judges of the Allahabad High Court. Mr. Kemp, I understand, was not able to lay his finger upon any such act on the spur of the moment. The result was that the Hon'ble Judges came to take a "milder view of the conspiracy." Your Honour, in your interesting order, made the attempt to rehabilitate the gravity of the conspiracy by pointing out to the act of organising the Communist Party of India. So the conclusion is that this is a case not merely of prosecution for holding and disseminating certain political views but also for organising political parties which stand for independence through revolution.

There is one more point which your honour has brought out in your order to emphasise the gravity of the conspiracy. You point out to the allegation that "the policies of the parties in question have been dictated by the Communist International." You remark that "it is from this outside connection that the seriousness of the case to a considerable extent arises." Now it has been stated in many previous statements that our Party, the Communist Party of India, was not affiliated to the Communist International. But we do not want to make it the basis of our defence. We claim that a political Party has a right to have connections and affiliations with the parties and organisations in other countries having similar aims. There is nothing serious about having international connections and affiliations. It is quite a common thing in modern times. Bourgeois bodies and organisations have international connections and affiliations. The Indian Chamber of Commerce sends representatives to the International Chamber of Commerce. The I.L.O. seeks connection with labour organisations all over the world through official channels. What is wrong if the Communist Parties maintain relations with their international organisation, the Comintern? If the right of the Communist Party to exist openly is conceded, then I claim that its right to have international connection can not be denied. By making the

Communist International the central figure in this case you are attacking the right of political and trade union organisation in India to have connections and affiliations with the International organisations. This right I contend is as fundamental as the right to organise a political party inside the country.

To conclude the introductory observations then I maintain that this prosecution amounts to nothing more than an attack on fundamental rights which would not be disputed in advanced bourgeois countries at least in principle. I consider that this case is not instituted for punishing us for committing any overt criminal acts, because there are no such acts brought forward in this case. All the so-called overt acts brought forward are quite normal activities which would arise in the course of the exercise of common rights, such as (1) the holding and disseminating political views (2) organising of political parties whose immediate objective was the complete independence of India from British Imperialism (3) connections with international organisations (4) organisation of Trade Unions and conduct of strikes. The last point I have mentioned merely for the sake of completeness. It has been stressed and well brought out by the comrades who have dealt with the Trade Union activities. They have proved that this trial is not only an attack on the right to organise Trade Unions but is at the same time a "strike breaking prosecution." It is needless to say that I thoroughly agree with this view.

If intellectual honesty were considered a necessary requisite in a judge in India then I think it would have been possible even for your Honour to come to the same conclusion about the nature of the case which I have laid before you, in spite of the oppressive climate of Meerut. Even such liberal bourgeois paper like the 'Manchester Guardian' in its leading article on the 10th June 1931 condemned the present case soundly as "a judicial scandal" and asked a very pertinent question whether it was "necessary to make a State trial for the activities of a few men who were avowed Communists?" I can quite understand that your Honour will rule out this question as irrelevant. It is not for your Honour to question, but to implicitly obey the bidding of the Executive which in this case is identical with the complainant. "Intellectual honesty" is not what is required of a judge in India but a sense of duty and as I understand your Honour's sense of duty is specially keen. Now "sense of duty" is not an abstract ethical quality unrelated to the realities of life, but rather a direct product of a whole system of thought based on class affiliations and strengthened by direct as well as indirect material gains. Your Honour's sense of duty is a product of ideology of the ruling class, the British bourgeoisie,

which is interested in keeping intact the present brutal system of exploitation and oppression which obtain in India. The "judicial" view which will be the outcome of your Honour's "sense of duty" will naturally be nothing else but an excellent specimen of class justice. It could not be anything else. We have no illusions, legalist or otherwise, whatever as to the justice which awaits us at your hands or in fact at the hands of any judge in India. We are going to be punished not for any criminal act, but merely because we dared to hold and disseminate certain opinions, dared to organise political parties which stood for independence through revolution, dared to organise militant trade unions and conduct strikes. Imperialism is out to crush the only force which it considers as its deadliest opponent and which alone has the potentialities of leading the revolutionary struggle for independence to victory.

But we shall not offer ourselves as willing and easy victims to the wrath of Imperialism. We shall defend these very rights which Imperialism is attacking through such cases. We shall defend and justify the right to hold and disseminate Communist opinions and principles. We shall defend the right of the working class in India to organise its class party, the Communist Party, defend the right of this Party to assist and be assisted by the Communist Parties in other countries and by the Communist International. We shall defend the right of Indian workers to carry on Trade Union struggle on militant lines and so on.

Such defence will necessarily involve the exposition of many social, economic and political questions involved in the working class movement in India as well as in the rest of the world. If the Defence statements have been long it is the fault of the Prosecution alone. In their enthusiasm to make this present case into a monstrous demonstration against Communism and the Communist International they have filed an immense mass of exhibits and evidence, involving the entire field of the Indian as well as the international working class movement, including its social, economic, and Political theories. The Prosecution in their Opening Address covered this entire field and attempted to distort and discredit the principles involved therein. It is no wonder therefore that our Defence statements, which seek to defend those principles, institutions and parties which you attack have to cover a considerable ground.

As I have said the evidence of any activities on my part is very slight indeed. There is nothing against me excepting the five points which I enumerated at the outset. Even the Magistrate has observed that my connection with the conspiracy was very short.

The Prosecution in order to make much out of nothing have deliberately misconstrued certain bits of evidence and alleged that I had some secret connections with some mysterious groups abroad. I shall have to point out certain discrepancies and explode their theory. Further right in the beginning even before the case started in the Lower Court, Mr. Langford James while opposing a certain bail application referred to me as a "notorious agent of the Comintern." I do not know on the basis of what evidence he made that statement. There is no evidence whatsoever to that effect. Probably the learned Counsel found that epithet as a particularly happy synonym for the phrase "a blood-thirsty man". This is quite in keeping with the idea that the Prosecution has given to this Court about the Communist International. In connection with the evidence regarding my membership of the Communist Party of India I shall prominently deal with the communist International refuting the misrepresentations of the Prosecution and justifying the right of the C.P.I. to affiliate itself to the Communist International. Finally in connection with the various books etc found in my possession as well as in connection with the Lenin Day I shall have to make some observations about Marxism and Leninism as the ideological basis of the Communist International.

CUSTOMS OFFICE SEARCH.

I arrived in India on the 10th of December 1928, as a deck passenger on board the S. S. Pilsna. I was accorded the same reception which almost every Indian student returning from a foreign country gets at the hands of the Customs officials and the C.I.D. It may be, that special attention was bestowed upon me because I arrived as a deck passenger. The search and the circumstances connected with it, even accepting the testimony of the Customs Official P W. 221, prove that the whole affair was a daylight robbery. No search list was made in my presence (even the witness does not claim it). None was supplied to me in spite of the correspondence which I subsequently carried on with the Customs authorities. On the day of the search I was assured that the whole affair was a formality and that the articles would be returned to me the next day. The Customs officials detained my trunk, called in a C.I.D. officer and selected the articles with his intelligent help. The articles were handed over to Mr. Chaudhri then and there (see P. W. 221). The C.I.D. officer makes a list in his office, probably adds certain material of his own and takes away certain other things according to the dictation of his superiors. Now it was not necessary by rule for the Customs officer to call in the C. I D. officer and hand over the material. He himself admits it (P. W. 221). There were the orders under the Sea Customs Act (Act VIII of 1878) which would

have guided him in his duties. But he calls in a C. I. D. officer and the result of their joint effort, as is shown by their search list is a monument to their pig-headedness. According to the orders issued under the Sea Customs Act regarding papers etc: prohibited from entering India (P 2489) they were entitled to detain only the items 6 and 20 of the search list P 1477. These are "Inprecorr" and the "Anti-Imperialist Review." There is nothing else in the search list which could come under any of the clauses of the order. Even clause 10 of the order which refers to the publications of the Communist International and which is purposely so formulated as to include a number of other radical organisations in foreign countries cannot be said to apply to any of the other items. About a dozen classical works of Marxism published by independent publishing houses have been seized (items 4,10,12,13,14, 15, 18 and 20). I maintain that even under the order quoted above the Customs officer was not entitled to seize those books. Then there were such books as a Russian Grammar (item 17), Monographies on medieval artists like Michael Angelo, an Albrecht Durer, a book of Folk-songs, and lastly a copy of the Code of Labour Legislation in Germany (see evidence of P. W. 274). As regards the letters, manuscripts and other papers, no list has ever been made, no paper bears any mark of having passed through the hands of the Customs officials (see P. W. 221). The C. I. D. office, it seems, has had ample time to do whatever it pleased with it.

I claim that I have been robbed of classical works on Marxism and Leninism and other books by the Customs officials who had no right to touch them even under the orders they are supposed to obey. Some of these are exhibited in this case. Some have been returned to me after a great deal of haggling with the Prosecution, whose narrow Police vision sees a red rag in every book where there is a mention of Marx, Engels or Lenin. A few others of these books are still under the intelligent care of Mr. Khairat Nabi. As for papers and manuscripts nothing of an incriminating nature was found with me. Two things are put as exhibits, namely some letters P 1479 to 1484 and secondly a type-script P 1488 which according to the prosecution purports to be an extract from the Colonial Thesis of the Communist International. About the latter I have this to say. I cannot say whether I possessed such an extract. I do not recognise P 1488 as my own. But I do wish to add that there is nothing wrong, nor is it incriminating to possess an extract about the views of the Communist International on India. In the same search there were a number of extracts about India from many Imperialist journals such as "The Round Table, The Empire Review and so on." These have not been exhibited.

Regarding the letters P 1479-1484, P. W. 221 says, "These letters contain no mark showing that they passed through his hands." When the Court attempted to elicit further information from him the witness said that he identified the letters "because he took down the list with the Police Inspector". Now it is very significant that there was no mention of the Police Inspector being present at the search in the Lower Court. Besides the letters do not bear any signature or mark of A. K. Chaudhri either. In fact these letters were not in my possession at the time of the search. I do not recognise them as my own. I do not know anything about them.

Finally I wish to state that the search was highly irregular and illegal. The official did not respect the orders under the Sea Customs Act which were binding upon him. He seized books he had no right to seize and put in things which were not there. My complaint is not against these petty officials. I attack the Sea Customs Act itself. I maintain that such orders as P 2489, are a part of the policy of the British Imperialist Government to stifle all free exchange of thought between India and the rest of the world, to create an intellectual blockade, and to prevent every contact between the Indian working class and the radical and revolutionary organisations abroad. These orders and their stupid execution by brainless officials are an instance of the reactionary and backward character of the bureaucratic rule of the British bourgeoisie in India.

Connection with "Co-conspirators" in Germany.

It is the theory of the Prosecution that I belonged to some mysterious group in Berlin and that I came here with recommendations from the same. The Magistrate has dutifully upheld this allegation. He says that I was "vouched for by the Berlin group", (C.O., page, 118) and was "in close touch with the Continental group" (C.O., page 197). He has nowhere said what this Berlin or continental group was and what it did and what relations it bore to the alleged conspiratorial organisations abroad. It appears that the ever-watchful agents of the Scotland Yard, who are always spying on the Indian students abroad, have not been able to improvise any reports whatsoever on this point. Probably the Magistrate relies more on the Marxist-Communist literature, which was found in my possession when I landed, than on anything else. It is true that I brought with me some Marxist literature especially in German. But more than that. I brought with me a Marxist-Leninist outlook on life. This not at all surprising. In Germany the proletarian movement based on Marxism is stronger than in any other capitalist country

in Europe. The biggest political party in that country accepts Marxism as its theoretical basis, at least in words. Marxist literature is freely available in the numerous working-class bookshops everywhere. Marxist literature received an impetus on the continent after the Russian and German Revolution. Many classical works of Marx and Engels which were out of print before were reprinted and received wide circulation. Current Marxist literature as well as reprints of classical works are reviewed in the ordinary bourgeois dailies. Any Indian student who has interest in widening his outlook would be naturally attracted to Marxism and Communism, especially in view of the fact that the classes and sections of people who accept this outlook are genuinely anti-Imperialist and whole-heartedly support every revolutionary movement in the colonies. Every Indian student in a foreign European country sees the bondage and the slavery of his country in a clearer perspective. The humiliation of belonging to a subject nation is powerfully brought home to his consciousness. It is natural therefore that he should be attracted by that outlook which has a genuine sympathy for the national emancipatory movements of his country. A closer study of Marxist literature revealed to me another feature of Marxism, which readily appeals to those who have had the good fortune of receiving some sort of scientific training. Marxism as a social theory is distinguished by the rigour of its logical construction and the universal and all embracing character of its postulates. Marxist theory is truly scientific inasmuch as it satisfies the two tests which are generally put on a scientific theory. Firstly it gives an accurate analysis of the existing social order in its economic social and political aspects, that is, it gives us a composite picture of the modern capitalist society, in which the various economic and social phenomena are shown in their correct causal relationships. Secondly it lays down the laws of motion of this social order, which enable us to predict the future trend of development. A Marxian analysis of the Indian problem enabled me to see the present plight of India in a clearer light, revealed the conflicting currents in the modern nationalist movement in their true roles and indicated the path of future development, a path which led through a workers' and peasants' revolution. That is in brief why I became a Marxist communist by conviction while in Germany. I was however not connected with any Communist group or body at that time. As far as my knowledge goes no Communist group of Indians ever existed in Berlin. As regards my alleged contact with Mr. A. C. N. Nambiar I have to say that I have heard of Mr. Nambiar as a journalist who wrote for various papers in India. I have no further knowledge of him.

P. 1683 is a Police typed copy of a letter alleged to be written by me. I never wrote such a letter.

Credentials:—The Prosecution assume that I came to India with some sort of credentials from some Communist group in Berlin. This is not true. The only credentials I had with me—and I could produce them if necessary for the satisfaction of the Court—were those from an industrial firm on whose research staff I was working as a physico-chemist. I hope the Prosecution does not regard such credentials as conspiratorial.

Regarding M. N. Roy.

I have no personal knowledge of Mr. M.N. Roy whatsoever. I never carried on any correspondence with him, never received any letter from him, neither had any occasion to write him.

Alleged Secret Correspondence with Co-conspirators.

The Prosecution allege that I was carrying on correspondence with that imaginary body called the Continental group. The Magistrate states that I was "in close touch with M.N. Roy and with the Continental group." He further states that I was 'well aware of the conspiratorial methods of corresponding through the means of seamen.' This allegation is totally false. It is based not on any concrete evidence but rather on the lack of any evidence whatsoever. The Prosecution has not been able to produce a single intercepted letter emanating from me and addressed to any of the alleged co-conspirators. The only pretext of an evidence they have got is the inference which they draw from P. 1674.

P 1674 is a photograph of a postcard written to me by Mr. S. V. Sovani, a dealer in scientific instruments. The letter is dated from Munich. On the strength of this great discovery the Prosecution promptly named Mr. S. V. Sovani as a co-conspirator. In this open postcard dated 3-2-29 Mr. S. V. Sovani writes to me. "I have posted the letter." Out of these words the detective talents of the Prosecution have constructed a very spicy story for the benefit of this court. Mr. S. V. Sovani is naturally a mysterious person who is being sent by the 'notorious Agent of the Comintern' all the way to Munich to post a secret communication meant either for the imaginary group of the Continental caballers or for the 'Moscow clique.'

The actual facts in this matter are as follows:—

Mr. S. V. Sovani is neither a 'conspirator' nor even a Communist. On the other hand when he heard that he was named as a Co-conspirator in this case he was so much astonished that he

issued a short statement to the Press. I have not got the English version of his statements which I think also appeared in the English Press but I have here a copy of "Navakal" dated 4th August, 1929 which I tender, D 723 and in which his statement appears. (D 724 is an advertisement of Mr. S. V. Sovani's shop in Bombay). Herein he says that his views are opposed to Communism. I met him for the first and the last time on the 14th of January 1929. Before this day we were perfect strangers to each other. On that day I happened to walk into his shop which is in Girgaon to make certain inquiries about glass-blown apparatus for scientific purposes as I was interested in the use and the manufacture of the same. I gathered from him that he was a mere dealer in those things and had no plant in his shop for the repair or the manufacture of glass-blown apparatus. In the course of the conversation it transpired that he was interested in this branch of the manufacture and was actually leaving for Germany in a couple of days for the purchase of the necessary plant. He asked me whether I could recommend him any firm in Germany for the purpose of buying such a plant.

I said, I could give him a personal letter of introduction to a Firm of Glass-blowers in Berlin. Before I left him on that day I asked him whether he would be kind enough to post a private letter for me as soon as he reached Europe. This was a personal letter to my friend and colleague, one Dr. N. Schoenfeldt, who is working as a physico-chemist in the Research Laboratory of Siemens and Halske a well-known Electrical Firm in Germany. This letter was to go by the ordinary mail on the foregoing Saturday but I had missed the mail. In the ordinary course the letter would have had to wait till the next Saturday. In the meanwhile I met Mr. Sovani on a Monday who happened to be leaving by S. S. Cracovia on Wednesday the 16th January 1929. I decided to give him the letter, obviously with the intention of getting it earlier across. Now both these letters, that is the letter of introduction as well as the letter to Dr. N. Schoenfeldt, were not handed over on Monday. Then I had a conversation with Mr. Sovani, but on Tuesday morning they were handed over to someone else who was in the shop, Mr. Sovani being not present at the time.

Now Mr. Sovani is neither a co-conspirator nor even a Communist. Further if I were sending a secret communication I would not entrust it to a perfect stranger like Mr. Sovani. Farther assuming I did entrust it to him, I would be careful enough to warn him not to write to me an open postcard saying that he posted it.

So after all the great discovery of the Prosecution regarding my alleged clandestine correspondence is a mare's nest. We

however know full well that such ridiculously clumsy constructions will be ultimately considered a sufficient cover to mask the class character of the justice that will be meted out to us in this Court.

P 1676: It is a letter alleged to be intercepted and withheld by the Police. I know nothing about it. Perhaps the Police could throw some more light on it.

Membership of the C.P.I.

Before I proceed to deal with the exhibits cited I may state at the very outset that I was a member of the C.P.I. at the time of my arrest. I joined the Party only a month or so before my arrest. I have already stated that our Party was not affiliated to the Comintern. This fact will not prevent us from defending the cause of the Communist International before this Court. In fact you cannot be a Communist by merely accepting Communist theories and principles in the abstract. It is the duty of a Communist to attempt to put these principles into practice and to actively support Communist organisations. The Communist International is the premier Communist organisation of the world—it is the world Communist Party, the centralized leadership of the entire Communist Movement of the world. The Communist International concentrates in its ranks the revolutionary experience of decades of Proletarian struggle, and is the truest inheritor of the best traditions of the foregoing Internationals. It is our duty therefore as Communists to proclaim our adherence to the principles and the programme of this supreme revolutionary organisation, to repulse the attacks and allegations that have been levelled against it in this Court, and finally to assert the right of the Indian working class and the right of the Communists in India to associate with this body.

The conditions of modern world economy demand an international organisation of the working class. It has been shown in a previous statement concretely how a sectional struggle of the working class in one country affects the working class in another. Hence no national organisation of the working class in any country can truly defend the interest of that class without being international, without maintaining international associations and affiliations. If you deny the Indian working class organisation the right to associate with the international organisations like the Comintern, the R.I.L.U. and so on, I maintain that you are denying them the very right of organisation.

The present prosecution is a direct attack on the Communist International. It is launched with a purpose to obtain a legal

finding which would make every contact with the C. I. and with the alleged subsidiary organisations named in the complaint and in the supplementary list illegal and punishable under S. 121 A. Apart from this the prosecution has not lost a single opportunity of vilifying the Communist International and giving a distorted account of the same to the Court and the Assessors. They were specially interested in representing the Comintern in as sinister colours as possible in the eyes of the general public in India. The Communist International according to their version is a propaganda department of the Russian Government. The aim of the Comintern is to foment revolutions in various countries with the sole object of "annexing these countries and subjecting them to the rule of the clique in Moscow". That is I think the view of the Prosecution fairly put. The petition of complaint bears me out in this respect. The aim of the Communist International as stated here is "to replace the various forms of Government throughout the world by Soviet Republics subordinate to and controlled by the Central Soviet Administration in Moscow." Now the aim of the Comintern according to its Statutes (P 2365) is no doubt the establishment of a world union of Socialist Soviet Republics. But according to the C. I. such a union can only be formed when the contracting parties stand on a free and equal footing. The Communist International recognises "the right of all nations irrespective of race to complete self-determination, that is self-determination inclusive of the right to state separation". (P 2339 page 29), The C. I. stands committed to the principle of "complete equality of all nations and races". As soon as in any new country the power of Capitalism is overthrown and a new Soviet Republic is established there, this country will naturally look to the U. S. S. R. for guidance and help. The existing U. S. S. R. will be the truest ally of every new Soviet Republic that may come into existence, for the most simple reason that these republics shall have to face a common foe namely the capitalist countries. In fact the constitution of the U. S. S. R. provides for the entry of a new Soviet Republic into the union. But whether such a new republic immediately enters the union or not will not be determined by "Moscow". It will be determined by the exigencies of the struggle of the Socialist Soviet Republics as a whole against the capitalist world and by the stage that struggle might have reached at that time. The programme of the C.I. makes the point quite clear when it speak of "the voluntary unification and centralisation of the military and economic forces of all nations liberated from capitalism for the purpose of fighting against Imperialism and for setting up socialist economy". (P 2365 page 29). Thus the unification which the C. I. aims at is to be voluntary, and not under the dictation of any imaginary "Moscow clique." We are however not at all

surprised at the deliberate distortion of facts and it is not the only instance on the part of the Prosecution.

Imperialist States know full well that when Communist Russia talks of self-determination and equality of nations she means more than the hypocritical phrase-mongers in the League of Nations. The granting of cultural, political and economic autonomy to the national minorities in Russia—the former Czarist colonies, her foreign relations with China, Persia, Afghanistan and Turkey, are resented by Imperialist Powers. These things mean to them a loss of prestige and an encouragement to the national emancipatory movement in the East. It is for this reason that they raise the bogey of the revolutionary propaganda of the Communist International, launch prosecutions against its alleged agents and attempt to give a distorted picture of the aims of the C. I. and vilify it in the eyes of the peoples of the East.

The agents of Imperialism however think in terms of historical categories which are decades out of date. They are still thinking of the Imperialist expansionist plans of Czarist Russia and they attribute similar plans to Soviet Russia. They raise a hue and cry about the "Red Bogey" and warn the peoples of the East against "Red Imperialism of Moscow". The Prosecution in this case is dutifully re-echoing the same cant when they talk of the C. I. plotting to establish a "Stalin Raj" in India.

But the peoples of the East have learnt to make their choice between Soviet Russia and the Western Imperialist Powers without the aid of these preachers. Louis Fischer, the brilliant historian of the foreign relations of Soviet Russia, an author who can not be accused of being a Communist, contrasts the attitude of the nations of the East towards Soviet Russia with their attitude towards other Imperialist powers in the following words: "the Soviet Union's relationships with the nations of the East are altogether different in quality and intensity. In Turkey, Persia, Afghanistan, Mongolia and China strong political tendencies resent, and, despite temporary partial lapses, must resist Western Imperialism. The world war aroused and galvanised political schools of thought that had ante-dated it, and the Bolshevik Revolution provided them with a practical example of victory over counter-revolutionary forces at home and abroad. The bond between Soviet Union and the East is their common anti-Imperialism and their common fear of aggression from Western Powers." ('The Soviet in world affairs' by Louis Fischer pages 727-728.)

D/- 21 9 31

Nobody doubts the repercussions of Bolshevik Revolution

on the national emancipatory movement in India. Nobody can doubt the growing sympathy among the Indian people for Soviet Russia and for the ideals, for which she stands. It is to counteract this sympathy and the influence of the precept by example, that the agents of Imperialism are always raising the bogey of the Russian invasion into India. It is for this reason that they point out to the propaganda of the Comintern in India as the spear-head of this invasion, and stage a trial of its supposed "notorious agents". I may once again quote the testimony of Louis Fischer to show how utterly baseless is this fear of a Russian invasion into India. On page 794 of the same book he says, "But with the coming of the Bolshevik Revolution, Russia ceased to represent a military threat. India is secure against attack because the British defences are stronger, the Red Army weaker than the Czar's and Moscow opposed to territorial expansion."

What British Imperialism is really afraid of is not a military invasion from the Soviet Russia, but rather an invasion of revolutionary ideas into India. The ideas of new freedom, of the emancipation of workers and peasants from the yoke of capitalism, of the rights of women, of anti-Imperialism which under the Soviet gun are being germinated in Uzbekistan and Turkistan, in the Tartar Republic and in the Crimea have already infected, to a more or less degree, China, Turkey, Persia and Afghanistan. The onward march of these revolutionary ideas knows no geographical boundaries of map-makers. The British Imperialists with their highly developed trading instinct think that revolution is an article of export and import. They are mistaken. The revolution in India cannot be stopped by issuing orders under the Sea Customs Act against the Comintern literature, nor by intercepting sealed packets of supposed revolutionary instructions from the E.C.C.I. Revolutions are not sent in sealed packets neither are they 'manufactured nor fomented'.

This brings me to another patent fallacy of the Prosecution. The Prosecution seem to imagine that we are organising revolutionary outbreaks independent of objective conditions. We claim that the C. I. cannot instigate or stage a revolution in India if the political situation is not ripe for it, if the revolutionary movement has not already struck deep roots in the national soil. The national revolution in India will be due not to anything that the C. I. may do, but to the British Imperialist exploitation and oppression, the poverty and the misery of the masses of the people of India. Those who care to reflect on the causes of this backwardness and poverty of India will not fail to see that it is British Imperialist domination which has condemned India to rot in social, economic and political stagnation. We are convinced that no

progress is possible inside the framework of Imperialism. Imperialism must be overthrown. We maintain that the Indian national revolution is not only inevitable but imminent. That is why we are amused at the Prosecution's picture of a placid and contented India being disturbed by the efforts of the Communist International to goad it into an unwilling revolution.

This should not however be taken to mean that we believe in the spontaneity of revolutions, or that we belittle the rôle of the Communist International as the conscious leader and organiser of revolutionary movements. We maintain with Lenin that the greatest stress has to be laid on the organisation of a revolutionary activity, although this is to be done in the light of the objective conditions obtaining in different countries. Our position in this matter has been succinctly put by R. P. Dutt in P 1190 thus. "It is the conditions of society that are producing chaos and revolution; it is the object of the Communists to end those conditions by giving conscious direction to the instinctive forces of revolt instead of vainly seeking to stem them." The Magistrate quotes this very passage in the Committal Order, page 46, but fails to understand its implication. Speaking about the C. I. he says, "In order to direct these instinctive forces it first of all awakens them. Where there are no feelings of class-consciousness it deliberately sets itself to arouse them. It preaches revolution in places where the idea of revolution had never previously penetrated." Finally he sums up the position with his characteristic sarcasm saying: "It is best to tell the masses what they want and if you say it often enough they will gradually begin to believe it and all will be well, but don't let them think for themselves. That might be disastrous for the Party; for the Party wants revolution." (page 47). The Magistrate adopts a sceptical attitude towards the thesis that "it is the conditions of society that make revolutions." He says, "Theoretically this may be so." Hence he sees no other position, and jumps to the opposite conclusion, that revolutions are 'fomented'. In reality however there exists an organic bond between the objective and subjective factors which make revolutions possible. The objective factors are the conditions of the capitalist Imperialist society which condemns millions of proletarians to wage-slavery and hundreds of millions of the colonial people to bondage and serfdom. It is these objective factors which themselves engender the conscious revolutionary activity and ideology which we call the subjective factor. The revolutionary activity and ideology of the C. I.—Marxism and Leninism—are not inspired from Heaven nor instigated by the powers of Hell. It is a product of the same capitalism which has brought into being

mighty and highly centralised forces of production on the one hand and the misery and starvation of millions of the toilers on the other. The revolutionary activity and ideology of the C. I. is the conscious expression of the proletarians and the exploited masses to free themselves. It is not necessary for the C. I. to practise any mass hypnotism on the people in order to make them blindly believe in the revolution. On the other hand if the material conditions are not favourable for the revolution, no "mass hypnotism" would ever help to create it. The C. I. is a menace to the entire bourgeois class, not because it "foments" revolution where it is not due, but because it promotes it where it is overdue. The Magistrate's solicitude to make the masses think for themselves is inspired solely by the desire to make them think as the Imperialists want them to think and submit cheerfully to the yoke of slavery and serfdom.

The masses of exploited workers and peasants throughout the world do not need the assistance of the Magistrate, Judges and other agents of Imperialism to teach them the necessity or otherwise of revolution. Every careful student of contemporary history knows that exploited workers and peasants have from time to time risen in isolated places against the conditions and misery and starvation which Imperialism imposes upon them. It is the task of the C. I. to co-ordinate and correlate these potential springs of revolutionary energy of the masses under the leadership of the Proletariat and to hurl it against the citadels of capitalism. The Communist International is pledged to conduct an unrelenting struggle against Capitalism and Imperialism. We do not deny that the activities of the C. I. often come in conflict with the interests of the Imperialist States. But this is not a conflict between an 'aggressive' Soviet Russia and the 'peaceful' Imperialist States, as the paid agents of Imperialism will have us believe. In reality it is a class conflict between the organisation of the working class striving for International socialist society, and the state barriers erected by capitalism in the course of its development, and maintained and strengthened by the present organisations of the Capitalist class. It is a conflict between the International Proletariat led by its vanguard and the gang of Imperialist bandits. In this conflict my allegiance will surely not be to the British Imperialist State which exploits the workers and peasants of India and denies them the very right of organisation. My allegiance will be most emphatically on the side of the C. I. which stands for a revolutionary overthrow of capitalism and Imperialism throughout the world.

*Comintern and its relations with the First and the
Second Internationals.*

I think former statements have effectively dealt with the

contention of the Prosecution that the Comintern is something foreign to the 'genuine' and bonafide International Labour Movement, that the Comintern is a Russian intrusion in the Labour Movement which came as the result of the Bolshevik Revolution in Russia. To every serious student of the International movement of the working class, it will be quite clear that the Comintern grew organically out of this movement which began in the middle of the last century with the dawn of capitalism and the rise of the modern Proletariat. In fact in the First, the Second and the Third Internationals mark three successive stages in the same organic development. I do not propose to give a historical analysis of the previous Internationals in support of this thesis. A brief historical account has already been given by Comrade Bradley in his statement. I shall only give the final conclusion which puts the relations of the three Internationals clearly, in the poignant words of Lenin. In an article entitled 'the Third International and its place in history' written in April 1919, that is one month after the foundation of the C. I., Lenin wrote, "The First International laid the basis of the International struggle of the Proletariat for socialism".

"The Second International marked the period of preparation—a period in which the soil was tilled with a view to the widest propagation of the movement in many of the countries. The third International has garnered the fruits of the labours of the Second International, casting off the refuse of its opportunist, social-chauvinistic, bourgeois, and lower-middle class tendencies, and has set out to achieve the Dictatorship of the Proletariat."

Coming as it did at the close of the period of classical bourgeois revolutions and at the beginning of the proletarian revolutionary struggle, the First International during its brief existence was not able to strike root among the working masses of the capitalist countries, was unable to achieve any significant organisational success. But ideologically, the First International was the first international standard-bearer of revolutionary Communism. Its leading spirit was Karl Marx who had already propounded these ideas fifteen years prior to the foundation of the International in his Communist Manifesto and in his Address to the Communist League. The First International included inside the compass of a single comprehensive body, both the political and industrial organisations of the proletariat. It set itself the task of organising the economic and political struggles of the working class on an international basis for the overthrow of capitalism, for the capture of political power by the working class and for the establishment of Socialism. Apart from revolutionary Communism, the First

International reflected two other tendencies, which were characteristics of the contemporary international working-class movement, namely the moderate Socialism of class-collaborationist type as represented by the leaders of the British Trade Union Movement, and the anarchism of the petty-bourgeois revolutionaries belonging to the less developed capitalist countries of Europe. In fact it was the struggle against the last-named tendency inside the ranks of the International which contributed to the break-up of the First International. The revolutionary Communism of the Continental Marxists and the moderate Socialism of the British Trade Unionists together enjoyed the overwhelming support of the conscious working class in that period. These two groups were further separated from the anarchists by fundamental difference in principle and outlook. These differences have been succinctly summarised by Stekloff, the historian of the First International. "A refusal to take part in the political struggle, the abandonment of constitutional methods of agitation, the repudiation of reforms, the rejection of the struggle for the slow and methodical storing up of energy, the repudiation of the dictatorship of the Proletariat"—all these he pointed out were the main features of the anarchist policy which separated them from the two other groups.

Nevertheless the ideology of the First International bore the stamp of revolutionary Communism right up to its last years. The greatest and almost the last ideological deed of the First International was the publication of three manifestoes, in connection with the Franco-German War and the Paris Commune, which are incorporated in "the Civil War in France." (D 409). Because of its political and organisational weakness the International was unable to materially assist in this first great uprising of the proletariat, although the individual members of the French section fought valiantly shoulder to shoulder with the Communards. In these manifestoes the International expressed its glowing solidarity with the first great initiative of the proletariat, which it enthusiastically described as "storming heavens" by the proletariat. These manifestoes helped to counteract the calumnies hurled at the Commune by the contemporary bourgeois press and explained to the workers in other countries the historic significance of the Paris Commune. In these manifestoes the First International hailed the Paris Commune as the first great attempt on the part of the proletariat to capture power, to establish the first workers' government. In these manifestoes the First International recorded and analysed the first great revolutionary experience of the proletariat and came to the conclusion that "the working class cannot merely lay hold on the ready-made State machinery and

wield it for its own purpose". Ideologically therefore the First International stood for the revolutionary overthrow of Capitalism, the smashing of the bourgeois State machinery, and the erection of a Proletarian State in its stead. Such was the ideological foundation which the First International laid of the international struggle of the proletariat for Socialism. The First International was the embodiment of the indomitable revolutionary will of the proletariat, the paver of the path for revolutionary deed. In this it does not differ from the Third, the Communist International. Only the Third International is the true and the rightful successor of the First.

The Second International which was founded in 1889, that is about seventeen years after the collapse of the Paris Commune and the First International, no doubt stepped into the shoes of the latter. It took upon itself the task of continuing the traditions of the First International. It was like its predecessor formed as a militant revolutionary organisation of the working class for the overcoming of Capitalism, for the overthrow of the domination of the bourgeoisie.

The struggle within the First International was between the revolutionary Communists and the moderate socialists on the one hand and the anarchists on the other. It was a struggle between the policies represented by the working class and the policy of those who had very little to do with that class. The Second International from the very outset started with the exclusion of the anarchists. The struggle which developed within the ranks of the Second International was between the two tendencies representing the working class which were already presented in the First. With the historic and economic developments which took place during the lifetime of the Second International (1889-1914), this struggle deepened, and the two tendencies grew farther and farther apart from each other, until those representing the "moderate socialist" tendency proved untrue to the principles of the International, ~~betrayed~~ ^{trayed} the cause of the working class, and went definitely over to the camp of Imperialism and counter-revolution, thus bringing about the collapse of the International.

If the First International lived and died in the early period of modern Capitalism, the pre-war Second International did so in the period of the maturity of Capitalism and of its growing over into Imperialism. During this period the proletariat grew both with in magnitude and consciousness and so did its industrial and political organisations. The historic achievement of the pre-war Second International consisted in this, that it gathered and united millions

of organised workers both politically and industrially into an international alliance against Capitalism. From this point of view the epoch of the pre-war Second International certainly marks "a period of preparation—a period in which the soil was tilled", as Lenin has put it in the quotation cited above.

On the strength of this organisation, it was possible for the working class of the advanced capitalist countries of Europe, to obtain labour protection, social legislation, amelioration of the working conditions, political rights and suffrage etc. In the early years of the Second International, this was possible, because Capitalism was then in its rising phase, new markets were being opened, Imperialist booty was pouring into the capitalist countries of Europe. But these very successes, as well as the bribing of a thin strata of "labour aristocracy" made possible by the Imperialist booty, soon spread illusions amongst the ranks of the leadership of the Second International. The "moderate socialist" tendency not only became absolutely dominant in the International, but had further degenerated into class-collaboration, blind faith in bourgeois parliamentary democracy, and in the belief of a peaceful transformation of Capitalism into Socialism. The national sections of the International became more and more divorced from the International struggle of the working class, got lost in national and "ministerial" questions and thus got more bound up with the bourgeoisie of their country than with the working class. The May Day, for instance, which was inaugurated by the First Congress of the International in 1889 as the day of demonstration for eight hour day, for labour protection and for the international solidarity of the working class against Capitalism, was forgotten and degenerated in various countries into usual evening meetings for social purposes. The ideological leaders of the International began to forsake the principles of Marxism and alter and revise them so as to suit the convenience of their bourgeois masters. Marxian philosophy was revised so as to introduce God and religion by the back door. Marxian economics was reinterpreted so as to spread the illusion that Capitalism could be automatically transformed into Socialism. Marxian politics was rendered innocuous and non-revolutionary by replacing the Dictatorship of the Proletariat and class struggle by the slogans of "class collaboration" and "Socialism through the ballot box." (This distorted version of Marxism known as "revisionism" became the ideological basis of the pre-war Second International and later on of the "Labour and Socialist International" in our own time). High sounding resolutions on war were passed by the International but they remained in the musty files of the International Secretariat.

Thus even before the great war, the Second International

had ceased to be the leader of the International proletariat in its struggle against Capitalism. At the outbreak of the great war, the ignominious collapse of the Second International was an accomplished fact. The International had simply disappeared while its national sections, in the various countries vied with each other in granting war credits to their respective bourgeoisie. The leaders of the "International" called upon the workers to enlist in the army in defence of their fatherlands—they called upon the workers to take part in the slaughter of their class brothers.

But, as I have already said, inside the ranks of the pre-war Second International there always was a section which stood out for the revolutionary traditions of the First International and who bitterly fought against reformism, revisionism, and the corruption of Marxism. Lenin, Karl Liebknecht, Rosa Luxemburg were among the leaders of this revolutionary wing even before the outbreak of the war. After the outbreak of the great war and after the ignominious collapse of the International which followed it, the need of the foundation of a new and a revolutionary International was already felt. It was formulated by Lenin in so many words as early as November 1914. In a Manifesto of the Central Committee of the Russian Social Democratic Party issued on November 1, 1914, Lenin wrote: "it is impossible to fulfil the task of Socialism at the present time, it is impossible to achieve true international concentration of the workers without a resolute break with opportunism and an explanation of the inevitability of the collapse to the masses.....The masses will create a new International despite all obstacles". After these words were written, it needed five years of war and revolutions, suffering and struggle to convince the workers of the bankruptcy and the treachery of the leadership of the Second International, and rally them round the banner of the Communist International. During the four years of war after the leadership of the International had abdicated, the revolutionary remnants of the International were consolidating themselves and organising an international revolutionary action against war. The Conferences of Socialists at Zimmerwald in September 1915 and at Kienthal in Easter of 1916 are two important landmarks in its process.

The Zimmerwald Conference saw the formation of the "Zimmerwald Left" which was the first organised nucleus of the future Communist International. The main questions which were discussed at Kienthal were, firstly the question of a revolutionary opposition to War and secondly the formation of a new International.

Thus the need for the formation of the Third International was felt before the Russian Revolution. But the toiling masses of

Europe had to go through a process of disillusionment and revolutionisation before the remnants of the Second International which remained true to socialism could actually launch upon the task of forming the new International. The victory of the Russian Revolution and the establishment of a workers' State in Russia certainly created the necessary pre-conditions for the formation of the Third International. But it is absurd to say, as the prosecution in this case make out, that the Communist International was purely a product of the Russian Revolution and had nothing to do with ^{the} Second International which according to them holds "rational" views on the Labour question. As I have already explained, the Third International represents the revolutionary tendency which was already present in the Second as well as in the First International. It embodies all that was best in the former internationals. It is the representative of the genuine International Labour Movement, utilising the revolutionary experience of decades of proletarian struggle in the interest of the working class for the overthrow of capitalism and for the establishment of socialism, the first stage of the Communist classless society.

The rise of the Third International.

The Third International ripened in the period of storm and stress of the Imperialist war and was born later on in Moscow, after the Russian workers had won the first great victory against the bourgeoisie. It was a period of acute political and economic crises. The entire apparatus of production and distribution being mobilised for the military exigencies of War, had lost its balance and was in a state of dislocation. The bourgeoisie of the various countries of Europe was completely occupied with War problem. Almost the entire proletariat was pressed into the service of the military, at the front or in the munition factories. The distress and the misery of the working masses was daily increasing. The whole structure of society was threatening to crumble. At such a juncture the Proletariat needed an international leadership which would show to the workers the way to take advantage of the precarious position of the bourgeoisie, initiate an international revolutionary action against the War, convert the Imperialist war into a civil war, and thus lead the Proletariat to the conquest of power.

In summing up the activities of the first year of the Communist International Lenin said, "If the International (meaning the Second International) would not have been in the hands of the traitors who saved the bourgeoisie at the critical moment, most of the chances in many belligerent countries at the close of the war including certain neutral countries where people were armed would

have been in favour of a swift revolution and then the issue would have been different." (March 6, 1920).

These traitors unashamed of their dirty work during the war continued their treacherous activities after the war. They met in an International Conference at Berne which sat concurrently with the Versailles Peace Conference—and continued their work of playing the good Samaritan in the interests of the bourgeoisie. When the European Proletariat was in the throes of revolution, these gentlemen set about the task of creating illusion among the workers about the League of Nations and about the Peace Treaty of Versailles, about bourgeois democracy, and began condemning the Dictatorship of the workers. No wonder that Lenin called these leaders of the Berne International "a thieves' kitchen—a bunch of low murderers".

The pre-War Second International had done its work of building up mass Labour organisations, Trade Union and political, the utilisation of bourgeois Parliamentarianism etc. It was according to Kautsky, "the instrument of peace time." During and after the War it converted itself into an instrument in the hands of the bourgeoisie—a factor of international counter-revolution.

In the meanwhile the leaders of the Bolsheviki, who always represented the revolutionary socialist tendency inside the pre-War Second International, had succeeded in translating their revolutionary theory into practice. They succeeded in bringing the Imperialist War to an end on the Russian front and mobilising the Proletariat for driving out the imbecile bourgeois Government of Kerensky. They succeeded in smashing the bourgeois-feudal State machine in Russia and in erecting in its place a proletarian State of the type of the Paris Commune—the Soviet State. They had succeeded in organising a Red Army with a well disciplined proletarian Kernel and with its help in defeating the counter-revolutionary forces of Imperialist intervention.

A solid basis for the organisational consolidation of all the revolutionary socialist elements of the pre-War International into a new International was thus created. A number of social democratic and Communist parties, groups etc: representing the revolutionary socialist tendency in the various countries in Europe met in Moscow and issued a manifesto with reference to the First Congress of the Communist International in the beginning 1919. This manifesto emphasised the necessity of founding a new International which it was proposed to call the Communist International. In justification of its name the manifesto said,

"Theoretically already Marx and Engels considered the name "social democracy" not correct. The shameful collapse of the social democratic 'International' necessitates, on this point too, a definite separation from it. Finally the fundamental Kernel of the great movement embodies already a number of parties which have adopted this name."

This manifesto laid down briefly the salient points of the platform on which the new International proposed to unify the revolutionary movement of the working class. Firstly it pointed out that the present epoch was the "epoch of disintegration and collapse of the world capitalist system which will also mean the collapse of European culture unless capitalism with its insoluble contradictions be destroyed." Secondly it said that "at this juncture the immediate task of the proletariat was the seizure of power. The seizure of State power means the destruction of bourgeois State apparatus and the establishment of a new proletarian State apparatus." Thirdly the concrete form of such a State apparatus was the Soviet form. Fourthly it called for a definite break with the right-wingers as well as the centrists of the Second International and considered it "essential to form a bloc with those elements of workers' revolutionary movement which (without having been the members of the socialist parties) are now in favour of proletarian dictatorship in the form of Soviet rule." Fifthly, it considered it essential to rally the support of all proletarian organisations and groups which were developing a leftward trend. Finally it called for the First Congress, which was "to establish a common fighting organ—a centre of the Communist International—for the systematic guidance and continuous coordination of the movement, which will subordinate the interests in the separate countries to the common interests of the International revolution." ("The Two Internationals," P 314, page 64).

The First Constituent Congress of the Communist International which met in March 1919, was nothing more than a demonstration celebrating the inauguration of the Third International. It did not draw up any precise conditions for admission to the International. It merely issued a manifesto announcing the formation of the Comintern.

The Second Congress which met one year afterwards, that is in 1920 was attended by delegates from all countries. The statutes were drawn up which proclaimed that the Third International had taken upon itself the task of continuing and completing the great cause begun by the First International Workmen's Association. Besides this, the Congress drew up the famous 21 conditions of admission to the International, embodying briefly its tactical, organisational and political line. These

conditions were formulated with a view to bolting and barring the door against all vacillating Centrists as well as Right wing elements.

Every Party or organisation seeking admission to the C.I. had to accept these conditions, which were formulated with a view to secure a perfect discipline within the ranks of the International and to prevent any future growth of reformism and opportunism. But politically these conditions did not contain anything more than what had already been accepted by "the Zimmerwald Left" in 1916 and later on reiterated by the various parties and groups which rallied round the manifesto issued by the First Congress. I shall only mention a few points from these 21 conditions which sharply demarcate the Comintern from the Second and Second and a Half International. Apart from once again defining the attitude of the Comintern towards social pacifism, towards reformism, and after having emphasised the need for active propaganda for the Dictatorship of the Proletariat among the rank-and-file workmen, and the necessity of combining legal with illegal work, this historic document lays down the attitude which the Communist Parties in Capitalist countries must adopt with reference to the movements of liberation in the Colonial countries like India, China and so on. This is, from our point of view, the most important condition which distinguishes the Third International of Lenin from the Second International of MacDonalds, Longuets and Kautskys which is today assisting the International bourgeoisie in the dirty work of Colonial oppression. It is clearly laid down in the 21 conditions that "every Party desirous of belonging to the Third International should be bound to denounce without reserve all the methods of "its own" Imperialists in the colonies, supporting, not only in words but practically, all movements of liberation in the colonies. It should demand the expulsion of "its own" Imperialists from such colonies and cultivate among the workers of its own country a truly fraternal attitude towards the working population of the colonies and the oppressed nationalities, and carry on a systematic agitation in its own army against every kind of oppression of the colonial population." (P. 2395)

Further the Second Congress formulated the line of the Communist International with reference to the pressing problems of the day in the form of theses. The experiences of the Russian workers in the first successful revolutions were formulated in the thesis entitled "The Role of the C.P. in the Proletarian Revolution," and in the important thesis laying down as to "when and under what conditions the Soviets of workers' deputies should be

formed." It formulated the attitude of the Communist Parties towards Parliamentarianism, the Trade Union movement, and towards the peasantry and the agrarian question. Finally it brought out the historic thesis on "the national and colonial question."

The Third International stands for International unity of the working class.

The foundation of the Third International was considered by many as a breach in the International unity of the working class. The so-called "Left Socialists" whose ^{role} ~~role~~ it is to keep the masses of workers under the influence of the corrupt Right wing leadership by using empty radical phrases, considered "this split" as a new obstacle in the way of the International workers' movement. One "prominent socialist" expressed such a thought immediately after the inauguration of the Comintern, that is in April 1919. He said, "It should above all be kept in mind that we are still in the period of the birth of the revolution. if it should prove that we substantially differ in principles, if we fail to come to an agreement on the question of freedom and democracy, if our views regarding the conditions under which the Proletariat ^{it} possess itself of the power, should absolutely disagree, and if finally it should prove that the war has infected certain sections of the International with the venom of Imperialism—then a split would be possible."

The "Prominent socialist" who uttered these pious platitudes of unity and shed crocodile tears over the Moscow manifesto was no other than Mr. Ramsay MacDonald who is one of the leading figures of the Labour and Socialist International, which today is soaked through and through with the "venom of Imperialism." It was the very same Mr. Ramsay MacDonald who is today spitting out the "venom of Imperialism" in the shape of bullets, machine-gun fire, aeroplane bombardments, lathi charges, executions etc. at the workers and peasants of India who are fighting for "freedom and democracy."

Mr. Ramsay MacDonald received a prompt reply from Lenin, who told him that, "we broke with the Second International because we had convinced ourselves of its hopelessness, its incorrigibility, its role as the servant of Imperialism, as the transmitter of bourgeois influence, bourgeois lies and bourgeois corruption in the Labour Movement."

The foundation of the Third International was not a break

with the idea of the international unity of the working class movement. It was on the other hand a break of the international working class movement with the opportunist and reformist leadership which was acting as the agent of the bourgeoisie inside the Labour Movement. The foundation of the Comintern was the first act towards the consolidation of an organised working class united front against Capitalism. The history of the various attempts at achieving unity between the Third and the Second Internationals has shown that the Comintern does not stand for a false and showy unity between the leaders, it stands for the unity among the rank and file of workers on the platform of a militant fight against Imperialism. It is the leaders of the Second International who have rejected such a unity.

The attempts for unity began in February 1921 when the Vienna International (also known as the Second and Half International) was formed, which proclaimed that its principles were no longer those of the Second International but that they based themselves on a programme of International unity. Almost simultaneously with this movement the Communist Party of Germany proposed a programme of united action with all other socialist and labour sections. This was done in "An open Letter" drawn up by the united German Communist Party and addressed to the whole Labour of Germany appealing for joint action on the immediate needs of the masses. This step was generally endorsed by the Third Congress of the Comintern in July 1921, which at the same time pointed out how "the German Independents brusquely refused to respond to the appeal of the German C. P. for unity of action, in spite of all differences, in the battle against the impoverishment of the working class." The Third Congress pointed out that the attitude of the centrists in other European countries was similar, showed how the reformists and the Trade Union bureaucrats of the Amsterdam Trade Union International were "responding to the attempts at revolutionising the Trade Unions by expelling the Communists", and came to the conclusion that "the centrists, in common with the social-democrats, are the resolute opponents of the proletarian struggle and the peacemakers of the counter-revolution." The Third Congress laid down that "it is the task of the C. I. to wage a relentless war against the Second-and-Half International as well as against the Second and the Amsterdam Trade Union International. Only by means of such an unrelenting struggle, daily proving to the masses that the social democrats and centrists are not only unwilling to fight for the overthrow of Capitalism, but are afraid to struggle for the simplest and the most urgent needs of the working class, will it be possible for the C. I. to liberate the working class from the grip of these lackeys of the bourgeoisie". (Decisions of the Third Congress, P 2396, page 27).

The question of international unity was considered in great detail by the E.C.C.I. in December 1921 and a Manifesto was issued laying down clearly and exhaustively the policy of the united front of the working class. This Manifesto exposed the hypocritical unity proposals of the leaders of the Second and the Second and Half Internationals and called for the revolutionary unity among the rank and file of the workers.

The Manifesto stated: "the leaders of the Second and the Second and Half and Amsterdam Internationals have shown up to now by their behaviour that, when it comes to the question of practical application, they in fact reject their own watchword of unity. In all such cases it is the duty of the Communist International as a whole and all its constituent sections in particular to expose to the masses the hypocrisy of these reformist leaders who prefer unity with the bourgeoisie to unity with the revolutionary workers, and who remain, for instance, a part of the International Labour Office, of the League of Nations etc. instead of organising the struggle against Imperialism." (Labour Monthly, Volume 1922). This Manifesto was followed by a Manifesto issued in January 1922 by the Vienna International which called for a joint conference of the representatives of the three Internationals. In February 1922 the enlarged Plenum of the E. C. C. I. confirmed the December Manifesto and authorised the Presidium to take practical steps for the realisation of the tactics of the united front, which it was understood must be adapted to the conditions in each country. The same Plenum declared itself in favour of the participation in a conference with the other internationals, asking for as complete a representation as possible of all the labour organisations. Accordingly the representatives of the three internationals met in Berlin on April 2-6, 1922. But they failed to bring about the joint conference as desired. The Berlin Meeting appointed a Committee of nine to convene further conferences between the three Executives. It also issued a joint resolution signed by the representatives of the three internationals calling for joint demonstrations in all countries on the following slogans: (1) for eight hour day (2) against unemployment (3) against Reparations (4) for the united action of the proletariat against the capitalist offensive (5) for the support of the Russian Revolution (6) for help to the victims of capitalist terror (7) for the establishment of the united working-class front in every country and in the International.

The Socialists of the Second International did not respond to this call. In principal countries the socialists refused to participate in the joint demonstration under these slogans. No wonder that the Committee of the nine failed to achieve the joint conferences as

proposed. The hollowness of the unity proposals of the centrists and of the Second and Half International was exposed. But as a result of the resolute stand taken by the Comintern, as well as owing to the fact that the period between 1919 and 1923 was a period of revolutionary crisis all over the world, a substantial section of workers under the influence of the Second and Half International and certain radical elements from the Second International came over to the Comintern. When however the revolutionary tide rolled back the remnants of the Second and Half International fell back into the bosom of the Second International, leading to its reorganisation at Hamburg in 1923 in its present form as the Labour and Socialist International.

Later on the Independent Labour Party attempted on one or more occasions to bring about a unity conference between the C. I. and the L. S. I. This proposal was unceremoniously rejected by the C. I. The C. I. did not want a unity at the top—the unity among the leaders only. The C. I. has always stood out for a united front of the workers against Capitalism which the leaders of the Second International have always rejected in practice. This had been sufficiently proved by the history of the former efforts at unity. The Second International too promptly threw out these proposals. (Mr. Brailsford's deposition).

There is no basis whatsoever for a unity between the two internationals. The gulf which separates them is unbridgeable. A united front with the Second International today would mean a united front with the bourgeoisie. The national sections of the L. S. I. in all capitalist countries are openly and shamelessly supporting reactionary bourgeois governments. In Great Britain the most important section of the L. S. I. has played the part of the Imperialist hangman, jailor and murderer in its capacity as His Majesty's Labour Government. The German Social Democracy who played the role of the bloodhounds of the bourgeoisie against the revolutionary struggle of the German proletariat, who assisted the bourgeoisie in drowning the German Revolution in blood of the workers, are today keeping up the same traditions by supporting or as they themselves call it "tolerating" the almost Fascist Government of Herr Brüning. Mr. Brailsford has told us in his deposition that "the L. S. I. would refuse to contemplate to take up arms to win power for the working class so long as they enjoyed the benefits of a Democratic Constitution". The German workers are indeed today enjoying "the benefits of a Democratic Constitution a-la-Brüning." Herr Brüning is ruling Germany without a Parliament for so many months. He is issuing decrees and ordinances which represent so many attacks against the living conditions of

German workers. Herr Brüning has instituted a virtual Fascist Dictatorship. Under these circumstances the Social Democratic Party of Germany, the second big section of the L. S. I., far from taking up arms on behalf of the working class to capture political power, has enunciated the policy of "tolerating" the Brüning Government in its last Party Conference at Leipzig in June 1931. This in practice means the support of the Brüning Dictatorship of the heavy industrial bourgeoisie against the working class.

The deeds of the other sections of the L. S. I. are similar. The record of the L. S. I. as a whole throughout the world is black with treason against the working class. The L. S. I. has broken with all the traditions and the ideals of the workers' International. It has nothing in common with the C. I. which is the true upholder of the cause of the international working class.

The Comintern as the Mass Party of the world Proletariat.

In the early days of the Communist International Social Democrats and Second Internationalists said that the Communist Movement was a temporary phase. It was a craze, they said, which would not outlive the post-war crisis. They had misjudged in both cases. Neither the post-war crisis of Capitalism nor the Communist Movement were temporary phenomena. Both of them had come to stay. Since the conclusion of the Great War world Capitalism has been perpetually in a state of acute crisis. The state of crisis is symptomatic of the fact that Capitalism is today in its last phase—that is the phase of decline and disintegration. Of course the social democracies do not see this, neither will they admit the Communist International has come to stay and has become a powerful factor in world politics.

Twelve years have elapsed since the representatives of the various working-class groups and organisations and parties met in Moscow to form the new International. During these twelve years the Communist Movement has grown in breadth and in intensity, strong national sections have been formed in the various capitalist countries. The C. I. has grown up into a world Communist Party. It has created a central organ unifying, centralising and coordinating the activities of the various national sections. Its influence is being felt far and wide in the far East and the near East, in the colonial as well as in the capitalist countries. The spectre of Communism is today haunting not merely Europe but the entire globe. And the spectre is growing in size steadily year by year. The organised membership of the Communist International at the fifth Congress was about 1,400,000. According to the figures given in the Tenth Anniversary Number of the "Communist International" (April 1929),

the total membership of the Communist Parties constituted 1,805,000. From the latest figures available the membership of Communist International has gone up to 2,500,000. ~~millions~~. This figure has been given in the Report submitted to the Eleventh Plenary Meeting of the Communist International held on the 24th of April 1931. (Telegraphic Report in the "Vossische Zeitung" dated 25 April 1931).

D/-22. 9. 31.

This undoubtedly a sign of vigorous development. On the other hand the International social democracy, though it today wields influence on a numerically larger portion of the Proletariat, is relatively on the decline.

The mere fact of the numerical superiority of the social democratic and Labour parties to-day cannot be considered as a proof of the inability of the Communist movement to strike root among the masses of workers, as the leaders of the Second International make out. Firstly the structure and the organisation of the Communist Parties ~~is~~ essentially different from that of the parties of the Second International. The Communist Parties are revolutionary parties, and as such mobilise only the most conscious, courageous and disciplined members of the working class in their ranks. Thus under capitalist repression and at a time when the situation is not directly revolutionary it is possible to organise only a courageous and disciplined minority in the ranks of the Party. But for this reason the Party does not cease to be a mass party or cease to wield influence among the broad masses of the workers. That such a party is quickly able to rally the majority of the working class round its banner and lead it to the capture of power immediately a revolutionary situation arises, has been wonderfully proved by the history of the Russian Bolshevik Party. The Communist International itself clearly realises this position. In the Second Congress, in the resolution on "The role of the Party in the proletarian revolution" we read as follows:—

"So long as the State power remains unconquered by the Proletariat..... it will be the rule for the Communist Party to have only a minority of workers in its organised ranks.only after the final defeat of the bourgeois system becomes obvious to all, will all or almost all the workers enter the ranks of the Communist Party."

Does this mean that the Communist Parties sit with folded hands waiting for the final defeat of the bourgeois system, and allow in the meanwhile the majority of the working class to remain under the treacherous influence of the Second International? The

Communist International realises that the chief basis of capitalism today in the various capitalist countries is that very section of the working class which is to-day under the influence of the L. S. I. and its parties. "If it had no basis", to quote Lenin again, "in this section of the workers, in these counter-revolutionary elements in the working class, the International bourgeoisie would be quite unable to hold out.....The more organised the proletariat in a highly developed country the more fundamental is the work demanded of us by history in preparing for the revolution and the more fundamentally have we got to win over the majority of the working class." (Speech at the Third Congress of C. I.)

Consequently the Third Congress which for the first time issued instructions about the organisation and the structure of Communist Parties, laid down that "the Communist Parties already possessing internal firmness, a tried corps of officials, and a considerable number of adherents among the masses, must exert every effort to completely overcome the influence of the treacherous socialist leaders of the working class by means of extensive campaigns, and to rally the majority of the working masses to the Communist banner". (P 2396, page 44).

Thus although the Communist Parties are able to organise only a section of the Proletariat in their ranks and marshal it for active struggle, they nevertheless set themselves the task of winning exclusive influence over the majority of the working masses, that is the proletarian, the semi-proletarian as well as ^{the} peasant masses, even before the capture of political power. Thus the constitution and the rules of the C. I. lay down that "the Communist International strives to win over the majority of the working class and ^{the} broad strata of propertyless peasantry." This is to be understood in the same sense.

This point needed elucidation especially in view of the idea which the Prosecution seems to entertain, namely, that Communists hope to carry out a revolution merely with the help of "a small body of resolute men" who work for it in a conspiratorial manner. "The Russian Revolution," said the late Counsel for the Prosecution, "was carried out by a small body of resolute men." Now it is true that the proletarian vanguard organised in the Communist Parties will be a minority of the working class before the capture of power and even for some time to come after it, but to quote Lenin once again: "with the vanguard alone, victory is impossible. It would be not only foolish but criminal to throw the vanguard into the final struggle, so long as the whole class, the general mass, has not taken up a position either of direct support of the vanguard, or at least of benevolent neutrality towards it, so long

as all probability of its supporting the enemy is not past." ('Left Wing' Communism, P 975, page 72). Thus a successful revolution can only be carried through by a resolute and a disciplined minority of the Proletariat only if it is able to rally the support of the majority of the toilers. The history of the October Revolution brings out this point very clearly. The success of the October Revolution was made possible by the fact that the Bolsheviks were able to rally the support of the majority of the toilers on their side. At the first all Russian Soviet Congress in June 1917 the Bolsheviks had only 13 per cent of the votes. At the Second Congress on October 25, 1917, that is on the eve of the revolution, they had already 51 per cent of the votes on their side.

In this connection I may cite the position taken by the Communist Party of Germany quite recently with reference to the allegations levelled against it by the Police and the bourgeois Press that the C.P. of Germany was forming terrorist groups to bring about an insurrection in Germany immediately. With reference to this allegation Comrade Remmele recently declared on behalf of the Party to the Press representatives that the Communist Party would not launch an insurrection unless the Party was backed by a wider mass support than it had at the present time. He drew an interesting parallel with 1918. He said that in 1918 the Kaiser-regime collapsed as soon as the mass-sentiment turned against it. Similarly the present system will be overthrown only when the situation will alter in the same sense.

The Programme of the Communist International.

The specific revolutionary tasks, on the basis of which the various sections of the C.I. strive to win over the majority of the toilers to Communism, certainly differ in different countries. This difference is naturally due to the different conditions obtaining in the various countries as a result of the unequal development of capitalism as well as of the varying strength and character of the proletarian movement in those countries. But nevertheless all these revolutionary tasks form part of one unified struggle for "the establishment of the world Dictatorship of the Proletariat, for the establishment of a world union of socialist Soviet Republics, for the complete abolition of classes and for the achievement of socialism—the first stage of the Communist society." The document which lays down succinctly and cogently the main perspectives of the struggle for the world Dictatorship of the Proletariat is the Programme of the Communist International which was adopted for the first time in the 6th World Congress in 1928. This is perhaps the most important document in the whole of the Comintern literature. The other resolutions and decisions of the C.I. in

general restrict themselves to this or that specific task ^{of} for the proletarian revolution, or sometimes to the general task for the immediate future. The Programme of the C.I. on the other hand determines our main perspectives for the entire epoch of the International socialist revolution. In this sense it is historically speaking the greatest document of the International workers' movement since the Communist Manifesto of Marx and Engels.

Eighty years have elapsed after the Manifesto first saw the light of the day. For decades past it served as the flaming torch which showed to the International working class the broad and bold outlines of the development of the socialist revolution, leading to the overthrow of capitalism and the capture of power by the Proletariat. During these 80 years the proletarian movement had gained in breadth and intensity and experience. It had passed through various phases, firstly the phase of the development of the scientific theories of socialism and Communism, the phase of the First International, secondly the phase of the organisation of the Proletariat on an international scale, that is the phase of the Second International, and lastly the phase of active revolutionary struggle which has already culminated in the victory of the Proletariat and the establishment of the workers' rule in one sixth part of the globe, the phase of the Communist International.

Capitalism too has developed. It has grown out of the phase of free competition into the phase of the development of monopoly, out of the phase of national development into that of International expansion. Capitalism has developed into Imperialism. The fundamental contradictions of capitalism, which have been pointed out in the Manifesto as leading to the periodic crises, exist today in a far more intensified form. The crises of modern times are far more widespread, far deeper, involve a bitter struggle for markets and colonies and consequently give rise to insoluble international rivalries and conflicts leading to world wars. Capitalism is today in a moribund state when every succeeding crisis brings it nearer to its final downfall. The world has already lived through one such severe crisis, which has shaken the entire capitalist structure and effected a breach in it—the establishment of the union of socialist and Soviet Republics of Russia. After the Great War, the world has definitely entered into a new epoch, the epoch of the final decline and disintegration of capitalism—the epoch of wars and revolutions—the epoch of the realisation of socialism. If the First and the Second Internationals have been the characteristic products of the two bygone epochs of the International workers' movement, the Communist International alone is today the only representative force characteristic of the present epoch. The Communist International alone leads the toiling millions of the world along the path

which leads to the realisation of the tasks set to humanity by the present epoch. The Programme of the Communist International is the clear and concise statement of the goals and tasks which human society must realise in the present epoch in order that it may overcome the ever-growing conflicts inside the modern social structure and do away with the ever-increasing misery of the masses, and thus clear the path of healthy progress and development. The Programme of the C. I. adopted by the 6th World Congress is the banner of the struggle for the revolutionary overthrow of Imperialism, for the abolition of classes, for the destruction of every form of exploitation of man by man. It incorporates decades of the International experience of the proletarian struggle. It is the essence of the most important achievements of the scientific theory of Communism. The Programme of the C. I. forms the basis of the world movement for Communism for the entire epoch of the International proletarian revolution. Comrade Molotoff in a speech at the 6th World Congress said that that Congress of the C. I. would go down in the history of Communism as a Congress which for the first time formulated the programme of action of International Communism.

I shall have briefly to touch upon the main outstanding features of the programme of the C. I.—features which are characteristic of the Comintern, and which we do not find either in the principles or practice of the L. S. I. It will be incidentally shown that the fundamental formulations of the programme are the results of a consistent application of Marxism to the problems of the present epoch, that it is the Comintern alone which has remained true to the struggle for socialism and not the L. S. I. And finally it is the C. I. alone which is the true representative of the genuine International Labour Movement and not the L. S. I. The Prosecution has shown their solicitude for a 'genuine' Labour Movement conducted on 'rational' lines. Our contention is that the only genuine Labour Movement which has grown organically out of a century of experience of the proletarian struggle is the one headed and led by the C. I. If you grant that the capitalist order of society is but a stage in the evolution of society and that for a further development of humanity and its civilisation, capitalism must necessarily and inevitably give place to socialism, then we maintain that the path chalked out in the programme of the C. I. is the only one which will logically and rationally lead humanity in the direction of that development.

The present period is the epoch of the general crisis of capitalism.

The first point which forms the starting point of the programme is the thesis that after the Great War, we have entered into

'the epoch of the general crises of capitalism, the first phase of world revolution'. The Great War was not a thunderbolt from the blue sky. It was the logical consequence of the phase of development which capitalism had entered into at the beginning of the present century, namely the phase of monopolist capitalism (Imperialism). This phase of capitalism is characterised by an accentuated struggle between "The Great Powers" of Finance-Capital for the monopolist control of the colonial markets, of sources of raw materials, of the spheres of investments; with the subjection of the entire world under the sway of capitalist exploitation, with the steady decline of the rate of profit in the capitalist countries, this struggle for profit-hunting is transformed into a bitter conflict between the powers for the redistribution of the world. This conflict, because of the growing Internationalisation of the economic life, necessarily culminates in Imperialist wars, which by the area they embrace and the destructiveness of the technique they involve, have no parallel in the world history.

Marx has shown that economic crises are inherent in the capitalist system. Under capitalism the principal means of production being concentrated in the hands of capitalist the production of commodities is for the market and for profit and is unrelated to the actual wants of society. The actual producer, the worker, being completely dispossessed has nothing to bring to the market except his Labour power, which he is forced to sell to the capitalists for a wage which on an average is nearly equal or more often less than what is needed for the reproduction of his Labour power, that is for his subsistence. Free competition exists between the capitalists and the race for higher profits results in a race for lower cost of production. The wage reduction after all having a physical limit, the capitalists seek to reduce the cost of production by improving their machinery, that is by increasing the productivity of their means of production.

Consequently the production of commodities increases, but not so the market, which after all consists of the millions of the toilers themselves which Capitalism has condemned to the lowest wage possible. The result is a crisis of over-production—the prices fall—firms go bankrupt—factories close down—unemployment increases—production falls. The crises of over-production are however periodical. The fall of production leads to the narrowing down of supply which in its turn leads to the rise of prices. Capitalist undertakings begin to prosper again and the whole circle starts from the beginning over again. In the words of Marx "Crises are always only momentary but violent solutions of the existing contradictions, violent eruptions which restore the disturbed equilibrium only temporarily". ("Capital" Volume III Part I page 231).

Capitalism has lived through many such crises during the last century and during the early years of the present. Every time the equilibrium of the Capitalist system was again restored through the development of the market. This was possible for two reasons; firstly the process of the destruction of the rural industry was not complete. This hand in hand with the growth of the petty farmer capitalist on land, led to the widening of the inner market. Secondly the peaceful as well as violent expansion of Capitalism in foreign countries (colonial expansion) created the external market. Each succeeding crisis shook the entire capitalist structure, the proletariat suffered untold miseries but the capitalist system as such was able to recover temporarily its equilibrium.

In the present period of monopolist capitalism the possibilities for the expansion of markets are much narrower. Each crisis of over-production leads to another much more intense than the previous one. The misery, the pauperisation of the proletariat and unemployment goes on ceaselessly increasing. But, as I have said, in the epoch of Imperialism a far more fundamental crisis arises which super-imposes itself on the crisis of over-production, and that is the one due to International rivalries, to the struggle between Imperialist robbers for redistribution of the colonies, for the sources of raw materials and for the spheres for investment of capital.

The world crisis, which came with the world war, was the first crisis of this kind. It was fundamentally different from all the former crisis, which though they resulted in terrible convulsions of the entire system, ultimately ended in the restoration of its equilibrium. The crisis heralded by the world war was so violent that it burst the system itself, split the world economy into two fundamentally hostile camps, the camp of Imperialist States and the camp of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat in the U. S. S. R.

The breakdown of capitalist system, the establishment of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat in one-sixth part of the world, the chain of unsuccessful proletarian revolutions on the Continent of Europe, the intense wave of mass revolts among the colonial peoples against Imperialism, these are the characteristics which marked the opening of the period of the decline of Capitalism, of the transition of Capitalism to Socialism.

It is, I think neither necessary nor expedient to argue out this thesis in detail. A cursory review of the last thirteen years is sufficient to prove that after the war Capitalism has entered into a state of permanent crisis, which is deepening every year. The theoreticians of social-democracy, of "The Labour and the Socialist

International" do not accept this thesis. They refuse to believe that they are actually living in the period of the break-down of Capitalism, a period of socialist revolution. They pin their faith on the theory of the stabilisation of Capitalism. They believe that through the growth of monopolies, trusts, cartels etc. free competition is eliminated, Capitalism becomes more and more organised, thus growing over automatically into the planned economy of Socialism. Hilferding says for instance; "organised Capitalism signifies in principle the substitution of the capitalist principle of free competition by the socialist principle of planned production." The "socialists" brushed aside the naked facts pointing to the breakdown of Capitalism in the present epoch, in spite of attempts at stabilisation. They say that Capitalism is going to live long and it should not be overthrown. On the other hand they actually attempt to help Capitalism to get over its crisis by supporting rationalisation because they say, to quote Hilferding again, "we want a strong and not a pauperised decadent capitalism, for it is always pleasing to the heir that the heritage left to him is as rich as possible".

The realities of life give the direct lie to this opportunistic theory of the automatic transformation of Capitalism into Socialism. Now it is true that the period of acute revolutionary crisis which immediately succeeded the close of the great war, reached its climax in 1921 and subsided thereafter. (This period is described as the first period of the present epoch in the Comintern literature). It is also true that in 1923 the second period set in which we describe as the period of partial stabilisation of capitalism. During this period Capitalism recovered from the damage caused to the entire apparatus of the Capitalist production, Industrial production recovered and in many cases was able to outstrip the pre-war level. The Social Democrats mistook this process of partial stabilisation, which was a temporary one, for a permanent tendency. They shared the same illusions as the economists of the bourgeoisie. For instance a stalwart defender of Capitalism like Gustaf Cassel points out to the increase of production and says that "the Capitalist system has been able to increase production during the last few years by three per cent. No other system achieved such a result." But the mere increase in production can not be considered as the criterion of the soundness or the stability of Capitalism. The increase of production which has taken place in the second period is being effected by the growing centralisation of production, technical improvement and capitalist rationalisation. Further this increase is taking place in an epoch when the possibilities of the

expansion of market are narrower. What is the result? The productivity of labour has increased enormously. The same amount of product can be produced with less labour power. Labour power is set free, because of the relative narrowing down of the world market; production cannot extend at such a pace as to absorb all the labour power that is being set free. Consequently there is a colossal development of chronic unemployment, a phenomenon which was not present in the "normal" Capitalism of the pre-war time, at least in the present magnitude. This phenomenon is characteristic of the present period of decline. In Great Britain the number of unemployed has fluctuated from 8 to 23 per cent of the total number of the employed between the years 1921 and 1928, while during the period of 1900 to 1914 the unemployed numbered only about 4.5 per cent. Similarly in Germany the unemployment even in the best period after the war, that is 1926 to 1928, was twice or thrice the average unemployment between 1907 to 1913. Even in "flourishing" America there has been a chronic unemployment of 3 to 3.5 millions even during the better years after the war. Thus generally speaking if the total estimated unemployment throughout the world before the war was about 3 to 3.5 millions, it was about 10 to 12 millions even in the best period after the war.

Another distinctive feature of the modern post-war Capitalism is distinct from its "normal" pre-war variety is that because of concentration of capital, trustification, rationalisation etc. the offensive of Capital against the working class has increased, the standard of living of the working class even in the most advanced capitalist countries (not to speak of colonies like India and China) has been continually going down in the post-war period. According to the calculations of the L. R. D. ("The two classes in 1931" L. R. D. Labour White Papers no. 43), the real wage of the working class in Great Britain has declined in the following manner. Taking the wage at 100 in 1900, it was 99.1 in 1914, 95.9 in 1920, 94.6 in 1927 and 88.4 in 1929. In Germany the picture is far more doleful as will be seen from the fall of the consumption of food stuff per head of the population given by comrade Varga. The yearly consumption per head of the population of wheat has fallen from 96 kilogrammes in 1913-1914 to 74 in 1925-1926. Similarly meat consumption has dropped from 52 kilogrammes in 1913-1914 to 48 in 1925-1926. The figures point to the general pauperisation of the broad masses in Germany. No proper figures are available for America. But even in "prosperous" America, as comrade Varga has shown, the increase of wages falls far short of the rise in the living index. Similarly comrades Bradley and Spratt have brought forward facts and figures to show the general lowering of the standard of living of the workers in India as well as the general decline in the

per capita income of the Indian masses especially in the post-war period.

The figures given above are quoted from Comrade Varga's book "The economy of the period of the decline of Capitalism after stabilisation". In this book he proves what I just indicated above, namely, that the period of partial stabilisation which succeeded the period of revolutionary crisis leads not to the restoration of the equilibrium of the capitalist system but on the other hand to a deeper crisis, to a new and a bitter struggle for the redistribution of the world. It is worth while to quote the passage there wherein this argument is summed up: "The possibilities of the expansion of internal capitalist markets in the great capitalist countries themselves are very narrow. A voluntary increase in the wage bill by the capitalist with a view to expand the internal market is out of question. The growing luxury of the bourgeoisie also has its limitations because of the compulsion for accumulation. The process of transformation of peasants into agrarian capitalists on the one hand and agricultural proletariat on the other is already complete in those countries. The export to independent countries comes up against the obstacle of tariff walls; the export to the colonies comes up against the obstacle of the monopolist domination of the same by individual Imperialist Powers; export to the Soviet Union is restricted by the foreign trade monopoly. Consequently the disparity between growth of production and the possibilities of its profitable turnover grows ever sharper. This contradiction must lead to a heavy crisis, to a new struggle for the redistribution of the world". ("The Economy of the period of decline of Capitalism after stabilisation", by E. Varga pages 58-59).

Thus according to Varga the period of partial stabilisation leads to a further intensification of the contradictions of Capitalism and consequently to a new period of crisis. The same thought was formulated by the C. I. even before the Sixth World Congress, in its thesis on the third period which is to succeed the second period of partial stabilisation referred to above. "This period" says this thesis, "in which the contradiction between the growth of productive forces and the narrowing down of the markets becomes markedly acute, leads inevitably to a new phase of wars between Imperialist Powers, of wars against the Soviet Union, of wars for national emancipation against Imperialism, of Imperialist interventions, and finally of gigantic class struggles." (Quoted by Bukharin in a speech on the results of the sixth Congress (P 1204)).

While the theoreticians of social democracy like Hilferding (in 1926, quoted by Varga in the book mentioned above) saw

In the phenomena of partial stabilisation a guarantee for a new period of rise for world capitalism, the Communist International and its theoreticians correctly foretold a new period of crisis. The realities of life have proved the correctness of the analysis of the C. I. The new period of crisis which was heralded by the American Bank crash in autumn of 1929, set in in 1930 with a tremendous fall in prices, trade slump and a phenomenal rise in unemployment. The increase in the misery of the toiling masses throughout the world led to the renewed economic struggles in the capitalist countries and to a new wave of revolts among the colonial peoples (China, India, Indonesia etc.). The crisis is not yet passed. On the other hand it is deepening. The recorded unemployment has reached the figure of 4 millions in Germany, it is nearing three millions in Great Britain and so on. It is bound to increase further in the coming winter season. The economic crisis has already led to deep political crisis for instance in Germany, now being followed by the one in Great Britain. The world bourgeoisie is wide awake to the supposed depth and the danger of the present crisis. It is openly reckoning with the possibility of a Bolshevik revolution in Germany (where the crisis is most acute); a revolution which it would be difficult to restrict to the boundaries of that country. It is doing its best to tide over the present catastrophe through international financial action, but the chief obstacle to these efforts up to now has been, as was to be anticipated, insoluble international rivalries between the great powers.

It is not necessary here to go any further into the question of the present world crisis, or to speculate as to its immediate future political consequences. I merely referred to it to complete the picture and to prove how the characterisation of the present epoch as the epoch of general crisis of capitalism is borne out by the actualities of life.

Fascism—a sign of the times: Before I pass to the next point in the programme, it is necessary to mention an important political feature of the present epoch of the general crisis of capitalism, and that is the bankruptcy of Parliamentarism and the growth of Fascism. The growing misery of the toilers, and the consequent sharpening of the class struggle and the strengthening of the revolutionary activity of the masses has forced the bourgeois Governments of the capitalist countries to throw off the mask of democracy and convert themselves into open bureaucratic and military dictatorships. This process has reached different stages in different countries, but generally speaking it is observable today in most of the capitalist countries, including

those with "long-standing democratic traditions". The extreme stage has been reached in Italy where the Fascist Government represents an open military dictatorship of the bourgeoisie: In Germany, Fascism does not rule officially, but thanks to the "toleration politics" of social democracy, Herr Brüning has been able to dispense with the Parliament and institute a dictatorship which is very little different from a Fascist dictatorship. Great Britain with its 'National Government' is rapidly arriving at a similar stage.

thus the bourgeois State, which in the epoch of Imperialism becomes identified with the finance-capitalist oligarchy, throws off the last mask of democracy and tends to develop into a militarised bureaucratic dictatorship of the bourgeois class in order to reinforce the general capitalist offensive against the working class and to crush their revolts. This however cannot bring any solution to dying capitalism. It is its last desperate effort to maintain its power. On the other hand it sharpens the class conflict, facilitates the transformation of the economic crisis into a political one. This extreme form of bourgeois dictatorship is reactionary in its nature. Instead of the order it proposes to bring, it brings chaos; instead of reconstruction, destruction of the most important of all the productive forces, namely the Proletariat.

The bourgeoisie is in short threatening human civilisation with destruction and ruin. The force that is capable of saving humanity and its civilisation is undoubtedly the Proletariat. The pressing need of the hour is the struggle for the substitution of the hated dictatorship of the bourgeoisie by the Dictatorship of the Proletariat. This brings me to the second point of the Programme of the C. I.

THE DICTATORSHIP OF THE PROLETARIAT.

If you grant that the present period is a period of the general crisis of capitalism, that the period of partial stabilisation does not lead to a new period of flourishing capitalism but to a new period of crisis, and further that the bourgeois State far from becoming more and more democratic is on the contrary becoming transformed into an open and brutal organ of bourgeois dictatorship, then you cannot avoid the irresistible conclusion that the process of transformation from capitalism to socialism cannot be one of gradual and smooth evolution but one accompanied by a revolutionary upheaval. This revolutionary upheaval, coming as it does in the period of developed but decaying capitalism, can lead to the next advanced stage in society only if it is carried out under the

leadership of that class which, apart from being the most important factor in the capitalist process of production, is at the same time the most organised, disciplined and intelligent of all the exploited classes. The immediate task which the Communist International has placed before the Proletariat of advanced capitalist countries is to wrest political power from the hands of the bourgeoisie, to shatter the existing State machinery, and to establish another based exclusively on the organised power of the Proletariat and supported by the overwhelming majority of the rest of the toiling masses. The Proletariat cannot abolish capitalist oppression and exploitation in a single military or political victory over the bourgeoisie. The roots of capitalist exploitation are deeply imbedded in the complex economic structure of the present society which cannot be changed over-night. The process of transition from capitalism to socialism will be spread over a period which will be characterised by a bitter struggle against the resistance of the exploiters, capitalists and landlords to socialist reconstruction. This struggle can be successful only if the Proletariat as a class organises itself into an iron dictatorship, which being supported by the broad masses of the toilers is able to suppress ruthlessly every resistance of the exploiters at home as well as repulse the interventionist attacks of the foreign bourgeoisie.

This idea was clearly formulated by Karl Marx very early. In his famous marginal notes on the Gotha programme (1875) he says "Between the capitalist and the Communist society lies the period of the revolutionary transformation of the one into the other. This corresponds also to a political transition period which can have no other State but the revolutionary Dictatorship of the Proletariat" (P. 1178, page 37).

Since these words were written decades of proletarian struggle have passed. The International Proletarian Movement has grown in volume and importance and has gained wide experience. It has won its first great victory over the bourgeoisie and has realised the slogan of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat in one sixth part of the globe, where the task of building up socialism has already begun. Basing itself on the rich experiences of the Russian Revolution as well as those of the other unsuccessful proletarian revolutions in Europe, the Communist international is today in a position to place before the proletarian masses of Europe concretely a programme for the Dictatorship of the Proletariat, pointing out in detail the tasks of the proletarian vanguard both before and after the capture of power and placing before the toiling masses of the world the perspectives of a world revolutionary struggle against Imperialist dictatorship which

will put an end to exploitation in capitalist as well as colonial countries and open up the path to world Communism.

We find the same memorable words of Marx being incorporated in the Programme of the Communist International. The transition period is however further explained and more specifically defined in terms of the present epoch. It is pointed out how the struggle for the Dictatorship of the proletariat in capitalist countries is intimately bound up with the revolutions in the colonies and the semi-colonies like India and China. In the words of the Programme, "the transition from the world dictatorship of Imperialism to the world Dictatorship of the Proletariat extends over a long period of proletarian struggles with defeats as well as victories; a period of continuous general crisis in capitalist relationships and growth of social revolutions, that is of proletarian civil wars against the bourgeoisie; a period of national wars and colonial rebellions which although not in themselves revolutionary proletarian socialist movements are nevertheless objectively, in so far as they undermine the domination of Imperialism, constituent parts of the world proletarian revolution" (P. 2339, page 21).

This paragraph gives us the correct perspective of the period of the Dictatorship of the proletariat, as a transition period. The prosecution have failed to understand the world-wide significance of this transition period in spite of the voluminous material they have brought on record. Shorn of caricature and cynicism, the argument of the late learned Counsel for the Prosecution would amount to this:— "the Dictatorship of the Proletariat has been existing now for a number of years in Soviet Russia. There is no sign of its "withering away." The transition period has become a permanency, hence all talk of the transition period leading to the millennium of socialism and Communism is all nonsense". That is the idea of the prosecution as fairly put as I could do it.

This fallacy arises out of the incapacity to grasp the economic tasks of the transition period. These economic tasks can be described as follows:—During this period the proletarian State basing itself on the broad masses of the workers seizes control of the highly organised and centralised section of the large scale industry and socialises its ownership. It seizes control of the trade and finance machinery. Having thus laid hold of the strategical points in the existing economical structure of society, it is in a position to direct the process of the transformation of capitalism to socialism. Under capitalism the process of elimina-

tion of small ownership and the concentration and centralisation of production and distribution has been going on. But it is far from complete even in the most advanced capitalist countries. It is quite clear that the break-down will come long before this process will be completed. Hence the task which devolves upon the proletarian State is to bring economic as well as extra-economic pressure to bear upon the capitalist section of national economy so as to progressively eliminate the small producer from the various branches of production and eliminate the small trader from the process of distribution. Thus in the transition period elements of socialist and capitalist economy exist side by side. The task of the State power is to make use of the commanding heights in the national economy which it has seized to ensure the progressive dominance and growth of the elements of socialist economy at the expense of those of capitalist economy.

This process is comparatively slow, especially when it is taking place in a single country surrounded by a host of inimical capitalist States, as is the case with Soviet Russia to-day. But in spite of these odds socialisation is progressing in the Soviet Union. This can be shown on the basis of a few figures. 75.3 per cent of the total industrial production was socialised in 1923-24. The socialised percentage of the total industrial production in 1926-27 was 82.7 per cent.

Similarly 91 per cent of the wholesale trade was in the hands of the State and the Cooperatives in 1926-1927 as against 78.2 per cent for 1923-1924. The share of the State and Cooperatives in the retail trade was 64.5 in 1926-1927 as against 41.4 in 1923-1924. The progress of socialisation was comparatively very slow in agricultural production, which is still based on small scale production and petty ownership almost all over the world. Up to 1927 socialised production on the State and Cooperatives and collective farms in Soviet Russia was almost negligible. In 1928 only 2.3 per cent of the total number of farms had been absorbed in the collective farms. In June 1929 this percentage has risen to 7.5 per cent. In 1930 40 per cent of the total number of farms were organised in the collectives. (Figures from Soviet Year Book, 1930 Edition). According to the latest reports the socialist sector of agriculture, State farms and collective farms, covers 70 per cent of the total area under plough. (Vossische Zeitung dated 18th June 1931).

This is a great achievement no doubt. But the process of building up socialism cannot go on in a single country as if in a sealed bottle. What I mean to say is that this process must have its repercussions, economic as well as political, on the capitalist

countries of the world. On the other hand the capitalist countries can and do put difficulties in the way of the building up of socialism in Russia in various ways. Thus the factors which determine the tempo of the development of socialism even in a single country like the Soviet Union are not merely those arising out of the struggle between the capitalist and socialist elements inside that country alone. The conflict between the proletarian State as the representative of socialist economy on the one hand and the other Imperialist States on the other, also plays an important part in determining this tempo. The stronger socialism grows in one country, the greater the breach in the structure of world Capitalism, the greater the chances of the victory of the proletarian revolution and of the establishment of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat in other countries. The transition period therefore cannot be conceived merely in relation to one country where the Dictatorship of the Proletariat has been established. It has to be conceived as a whole period of Proletarian Revolution, "in which the capitalist and socialist economic system exists side by side in peaceful relations as well as in armed conflict, a period of the formation of a Union of Soviet Republics, a period of wars of Imperialist States against the Soviet States." Such is the perspective which the Programme of the C.I. depicts of the period of transition. If you will take this broad view into consideration, the fallacy of the Prosecution argument becomes quite apparent.

The Dictatorship of the Proletariat not the rule of a clique.

The Prosecution have tried to make out that the Dictatorship of the Proletariat is to be "carried on" by a little body of men like say the Moscow clique. I think their idea is something like this:—The Proletariat dominates over the rest of the population, the Party over the Proletariat, and the clique over the Party, thus the entire Dictatorship of the Proletariat reduces itself to a rule of the clique, or to make it more specific to the rule of "Mr. Stalin," the almighty. The Prosecution, being members of the bourgeois class are perhaps incapable of thinking in terms of social and class forces. They can perhaps only think in terms of cliques and of individual dictators and magnates. Perhaps their idea of the Soviet Union is that it is a huge joint-stock company, the bulk of whose shares is concentrated in the hands of a clique and perhaps in those of "Mr. Stalin" himself.

We grant that the leadership in the great historical, social process going on in Russia belongs to the Communist Party. We grant that the Communist Party of the Soviet Union consists even today of a minority of the proletariat and consequently of the entire population of Russia. But do these facts warrant the

conclusion that it is the rule of a clique forced upon the millions of Russia against their will? Would it have been possible for a handful of Bolsheviks to capture power in Russia? Had they not obtained the support and the active participation of the overwhelming majority of the toilers? Would they have been able to create Red Army out of starving, and ill-equipped peasants and workmen, a Red Army which defeated the counter-revolutionary intervention of the Imperialist armies? Would the gigantic process of collectivisation of agriculture—this mighty stride from serfdom to socialism—have been possible without the energetic and enthusiastic participation of the millions of poor peasants and farm labourers? Would the unheard of tempo of industrialisation have been possible without the active support of the broad masses of the proletariat?

The Communist Party is undoubtedly the motive force of the Proletarian Government of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat in Russia, because it consists of the most conscious and the intelligent vanguard of the Proletariat, because it enjoys the support not only of the broad masses of the proletariat but of the poor peasants and other toilers as well, who all together form the overwhelming majority of the population of Russia.

The Prosecution theory of the "Moscow clique" does not find favour with even such a critical observer like Mr. Brailsford. In his book, "Soviets at work" (P 1777) he says, "the fountain of power seems to spring from the factory and village, nor is this mere illusion, for while the Party keeps the vital decisions in its disciplined hands, it knows very well that it must contrive at its peril to keep factory and village loyal and contented. On the administrative side at least this is much more nearly "Government of the people by the people" than any other system which obtains in Europe." (Page 142).

When questioned on the same subject by the Crown Counsel, Mr. Brailsford reiterated the same thought in his deposition. He said, "it is not correct to say that my experience of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat in the only country where it existed is that it amounted in practice to the Dictatorship of the Communist Party over the proletariat."

Even such a bourgeois writer like Rene Fullop Muller admits in his "Mind and Face of Bolshevism" that "the masses actually rule in Russia." Thus we see that even the Second Internationalist like Mr. Brailsford and the bourgeois writer like Rene Fullop Muller do not go so far as to support the mischievous vilification hurled by the Prosecution against the Dictatorship of the

Proletariat in Soviet Russia. But Mr. Kishori Lal Ghosh a co-accused in this case, who, I believe, considers himself to be "a socialist of a more radical hue than the moderate Second Internationalists" finds himself in surprisingly close agreement with the Prosecution on this point. Mr. Ghosh finds it quite necessary to express himself quite strongly on this point. So great is his love for the working class that he feels "a thrill of delight" (not a thrill of "fright" as the type-script unfortunately read) for a State which claims to be "the only socialist State in the world." But alas! greater was his grief when he found that the Party which swears by the Proletariat was "controlled by a clique" and had "put itself in a position greatly similar to what the British ruling class takes up in India." For Mr. Ghosh proletarian rule in Soviet Russia is the same as the rule of the British Imperialist oligarchy in India! This is an admirable sentimentably expressed, and especially valuable as coming from a "socialist" and a co-accused in a Communist Conspiracy Case! I hope the Prosecution will properly appreciate and remunerate the excellent services of Mr. Ghosh in ably paraphrasing and elucidating their own theory about the Dictatorship of the Proletariat, so that his efforts may not have been in vain.

Proletarian rule truly democratic.

In this connection I shall have to deal with another objection to the Dictatorship of the Proletariat namely that there is no democracy under it, which will also bring me to the next point in the Programme, namely, to the Soviets as the organs of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat.

It has now-a-days become the daily business of the various sections of the L.S.I. and of its executive organs to decry the Dictatorship of Proletariat in Russia and to shed tears over the lack of democracy there, over the absence of freedom of opinion, press etc under Proletarian rule. Mr. Ghosh has brought lengthy extracts from the recent Manifestoes of the L.S.I. to the workers of the Soviet Union on the record which run in this strain. These renegades of the Labour and Socialist International, blinded by their love for the bourgeoisie and their hatred for the Soviet Union, fail to see the brutal dictatorship in the bourgeois democracies and the broad-based, democracy in the Proletarian Dictatorship.

The Dictatorship of the Proletariat is a class rule just as much as the State in a capitalist country is a class rule. The State in capitalist countries is entirely dominated by capitalists and big land-owners, that is by a class of handful of exploiters.

The State machinery is exclusively in the hands of the exploiters and is used by them against the majority of the toilers to preserve and perpetuate their privileges to rob and exploit them. It is all the more necessary for the bourgeois State therefore to mask itself as a democratic State, as a State whose power is derived from the people by election on the basis of adult suffrage etc. In actual practice however these rights of adult suffrages and secret ballots etc can be made to work in the interest of the economically dominant exploiting class. Even in countries with so-called "long-standing democratic traditions" the Democratic Government is nothing but the autocratic dictatorship of the capitalist and the land-owning class. Under Capitalism the bourgeoisie is always able to keep power in its own hands because of its economic dominance, because it can control the press, publicity and education, because of corruption and bribery. The bourgeois democratic State therefore is an engine of oppression wielded by a handful of the capitalists and landlords against the majority of the toilers, a weapon used by the exploiters to protect their own privileges. Bourgeois law which hypocritically proclaims the equality of all men before law is in reality class law made by the bourgeoisie to protect the property interests of its own class. This practice brings out most flagrantly the inequality between the capitalists and the workmen, the landlords and the tenants, and in short between the possessors and the dispossessed.

The Dictatorship of the Proletariat is also a class State. It makes no secret of it. It is the class State of the Proletariat which is supported by the majority of the toiling masses. It is an instrument of oppression, wielded by the toiling masses, against their former oppressors, the capitalists and the landlords, wielded by the majority of the population against the insignificant minority. The law which operates under it is openly and avowedly a class law which safeguards the interests of ^{the} overwhelming majority of the toilers against the bourgeoisie and their hangers-on. The Proletarian law is a weapon in the hands of the worker's State, which secures the benefits of the revolution to the toilers, crushes the resistance of the bourgeoisie and paves the way towards Socialism. The Dictatorship of the proletariat therefore is the dictatorship of the majority of the toilers over the minority of the exploiters, in the interest of the social evolution of humanity as a whole.

Soviet as State form of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat.

The Dictatorship of the Proletariat as an organ of power arises out of the revolutionary initiative of the toiling masses

themselves. Hence its State form is based on the organs of struggle which the toiling masses themselves build up to fight out their economic battles against the capitalists and the landlords. The State form of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat is therefore Soviets, that is councils of workers, peasants and soldier deputies which developed out of such organs of economic struggle as strike committees, peasants committees etc. In the words of the programme "this is precisely the type of State which, emerging as it does directly out of the broadest possible mass movement of the toilers, secures the maximum mass activity and is consequently the surest guarantee of final victory." (Page 23).

Soviet Dictatorship is the highest form of democracy, namely proletarian democracy, while bourgeois democracy is a masked form of bourgeois dictatorship. The first pre-condition for the existence of a Soviet State is the depriving of the exploiters of the means of production, that is factories, land etc. and placing them in the hands of the workers and the peasants. By doing this the Soviet power removes that main source of inequality which makes "democratic rights and liberties" under bourgeois rule illusory as far as the exploited masses are concerned. Further Soviet power does not rest on a machinery of repression consisting of army, police and bureaucracy which as in the bourgeois State is separated from the masses and is imposed upon them from above. Soviets rise to power by smashing this machinery and effecting a general arming of the toilers. The armed forces of the Soviet State are in close and constant touch with the masses of the toilers. Thus in the very act of coming to power the Soviets remove two of the greatest obstacles in the way of the realisation of true democracy, the democracy for the toiling majority, namely (1) the bourgeois monopoly of the important means of production and (2) the repressive machinery of the bourgeois State. This fact alone is sufficient to prove the superiority of Soviet democracy to bourgeois democracy.

D/ 23.9.31

The difference between bourgeois democracy and Soviet democracy has been very neatly summarised by R. P. Dutt in "The two internationals", P. 314 in the following words:—

"Bourgeois democracy, with its Parliamentary system uses words to induce belief in popular participation in Government. Actually the masses and their organisations are held far out of the reach of real power and the real State administration.....
Bourgeois democracy and its Parliamentary system sharpens the

separation of the masses from the State by the division of the Government into legislative and executive powers and through Parliamentary mandates beyond popular recall.

The Soviet system by contrast, unites the masses with the organs of Government by right of recall, by amalgamation of legislative and executive powers and by use of working Boards. Above all this union is fostered by the fact that in the Soviet system, elections are based not on arbitrary territorial districts but on units of production." (Page 79-80).

Under the Soviet system every individual votes and elects not as a "citizen" but as a worker, a peasant, in short as a toiler. The basic unit of Self-Government is the factory, the workshop or the village Soviets, on which is created the whole edifice of the Soviet State. Thus every toiler is drawn into the legislative and administrative work of the State on the basis of his day-to-day struggle as a member in a unit of production. It is this structure of the Soviet State which ensures democracy to the Proletariat and to the rest of the toiling masses.

Even bourgeois writers and observers have admitted the democratic achievements of the Soviet system; they freely admit that the Soviet system has succeeded in awakening initiative and self-confidence in the toiling man. No other country has succeeded in completely abolishing inequality based upon sex, religion and nationality. Nowhere have the creative forces of the masses been so wonderfully organised for the creation of a new order of society in which the exploitation of man by man will cease for ever. But the rascals and renegades of the Labour and Socialist International have no eyes for all this. In a recent manifesto, which is quoted in extenso by Mr. Ghosh in his statement, while showing their hypocritical "concern for the fate of the Russian Revolution" they are giving currency to the meanest type of bourgeois lies against the Soviet State. They bewail the lack of freedom under the Soviet rule. "Freedom must be restored to the peoples of the Soviet Union," they piously proclaim, "freedom of speech, freedom of association etc." Indeed! If they wish that their friends, the capitalists and the rich peasants should have freedom to organise counter-revolutionary plots against the power of the workers' and peasants' Soviet, then they may wail and weep in vain. There is not, and will not be unrestricted freedom and political rights for the exploiters under the Soviet rule.

Great is the concern of these Labour Jackeys of Imperialism for "the plight of peasants", in Soviet Russia. They talk of "the cleft between the working class and the peasantry" under the Soviet rule

and warn against the danger of the peasants being filled with "hatred against the working class and the revolution." The hatred which the L. S. I. feels for the workers' and peasants' Soviet rule is too great to enable them to grasp the basic fact about the Soviet system, namely the firm alliance between the Proletariat and the peasantry. The victory of the Proletariat has been made possible in Russia only because it obtained the active support of ^{the} broad masses of poor peasants, and land labourers. The defeat of the Imperialist intervention was achieved because the Proletariat mobilised the poor peasantry on the basis of a programme of agrarian revolution. Finally to-day ^{the} gigantic mass movement for collectivisation of agriculture is being carried out only because the Soviets under the leadership of ^{the} Proletariat have succeeded in drawing the broad masses of the poor peasants into the struggle for socialism, into the work of building up socialist agriculture.

But the traitors of the L. S. I. have learnt nothing. They go on repeating parrot-like the bourgeois lies about "forcible collectivisation", about the "expropriation of the peasantry." The process of collectivisation of agriculture which assumed the magnitude of a mass movement in Russia in the winter of 1929-30 was carried out under the slogan issued by the Central Committee of the C. P. S. U, namely "convince, not coerce". In general the Leninist rule which forms the basic condition for maintaining intact the alliance with the masses of the middle peasantry, namely that compulsion is inadmissible in our relations with the middle peasants, was implicitly followed. But we do not deny that force was used during the process of collectivisation. The Dictatorship of the Proletariat is not ashamed to use violent methods in so far as they are directed against the exploiters, the bourgeoisie and the rich farmers, and during the progress of collectivisation such force was used and expropriations were carried out. The rich peasants who possessed better implements, who could afford to use manure and comparatively better methods, were able to employ Labour and exploit the neighbouring poor peasants. They dreamt of growing rich at the expense of their poor neighbours. The rich peasant was opposed to a collective organisation of agriculture which would transform the poor peasants of the neighbourhood into members of a huge collective farm, run by machinery and modern methods, and thus deprive him of the supply of cheap labour. His economic superiority, based on his better implements etc: would pale into insignificance before a collective farm using tractors, modern methods, good seeds and so on which were out of his reach. To the poor peasants and the land labourers the collective farm afforded the immediate possibility of raising his standard

of life^{and} escaping hardship of a "horseless farm". The movement of collectivisation being a part of the struggle for socialism was a class struggle which had to be carried on under the slogan "liquidation of Kulaks as a class". In this struggle expropriations did take place, but it was the expropriation of the recalcitrant Kulaks, and the expropriated means of production were socialised by being added on to the neighbouring collectives. This expropriation of the property of the Kulaks and its subsequent socialisation was carried out, not by the Proletariat alone, but by the broad masses of the land labourers and the village poor in alliance with the middle peasants.

Thus when the L. S. I. talks of forcible methods and expropriation, it is coming out not as the defender of the workers and peasants of Russia, in the interests of the ultimate triumph of socialism, but as the defender of Kulaks and rich peasants, of elements which are opposing the onward march of socialism. The L. S. I. in its hypocritical manifesto unmasks itself as the counter-revolutionary prop of the capitalist social order, as the enemy of socialism.

We frankly admit that Soviet democracy is pre-eminently proletarian democracy, that is the industrial Proletariat occupies the most favoured position in this system. The predominance of the proletarian element in the higher organs of the Soviets is secured by giving a proportionately higher representation to the urban Soviets than to the rural Soviets and approximately balancing out the numerical superiority of the rural population. The constitution of the U. S. S. R. lays down that "the Congress of Soviets of the Union Republics is composed of delegates from the urban Soviets, one delegate being allowed per 25000 inhabitants, and delegates from the Provincial Congress of Soviets, one delegate being allowed per 1,25,000 thousand inhabitants," (Chapter XI of the constitution quoted from the Soviet Year Book, 1930, page 16). This preference to the industrial Proletariat in "the supreme organ of authority of the Union of Socialist and Soviet Republics" is numerically just enough to make good the higher percentage of the rural population in Russia which is 82.1 per cent as against 17.9 urban, and secure the dominance of the Proletariat there. (Figures are for 1926 Soviet Year Book, 1930, page 22)

The Soviet State, functioning as the Dictatorship of the proletariat is the rule of a single class, the Proletariat. The Proletariat being the most important class in the modern process of production, being the most aggressive, the best organised and politically riper class, is the only one which is

capable of carrying out a resolute policy of ruthlessly suppressing all capitalist elements and of building up socialism after the capture of power. The favoured position which the Proletariat temporarily enjoys under the Soviet system is necessary to secure its leadership, to eliminate all vacillations in dealing with the exploiters, to draw in the masses of semi-proletarians and poor peasants in the struggle for socialism. The structure of the Soviet State is quite transparent. Unlike the bourgeois democratic State it openly admits its class character. It makes no attempt to mask the temporary advantage which the Proletariat holds over the petty bourgeois peasantry. In the words of the Programme, "the proletariat holds power not for the purpose of perpetuating it, not for the purpose of protecting narrow craft and professional interests, but for the purpose of uniting the backward and scattered rural Proletariat, the semi-proletariat and the toiling peasants still more closely with the more progressive strata of the workers for the purpose of gradually and systematically overcoming class divisions altogether," (page 24). As socialism progresses, as small scale individualised production is replaced more and more by large scale socialised production, not only in industry but also in agriculture, and as the line of demarcation between the town and the countryside disappears, these temporary advantages which the Proletariat enjoys over the peasantry too disappear. The base of proletarian democracy broadens and it becomes transformed into democracy for the entire toiling population in the truest sense of the word.

The Labour and Socialist International sees the cleft between the proletariat and the peasantry under the Soviet rule; but it fails to grasp that this cleft is inherent in Capitalism and has been inherited by the Soviet rule from Capitalism. As long as small producers exist who have a petty bourgeois possessor's mentality so long will there be a danger of the resuscitation of Capitalism, of the rehabilitation of the exploiter. It is only the firm rule of the proletariat which is able to avert this danger, carry forward the policy of industrialisation and collectivisation of agriculture, of reconstruction of Socialism, which will eliminate the very economic basis for the present disparity between the proletariat and the peasantry. Under the guise of democracy, the L. S. I. is pleading on behalf of that very exploiting section which is the enemy of Socialism. The democracy which the L. S. I. seeks to see in Russia is bourgeois democracy, which would mean the return of the exploiter and the capitalist, and the destruction of the achievements of the revolution, in short the re-institution of bourgeois dictatorship. Soviet democracy paves the way to the highest and the broadest form of democracy of the toiling masses. If you reject

Soviet democracy, then the only alternative is the brutal dictatorship of the exploiters, the capitalists and the landlords which you see in the rest of the world.

World Communism the final goal of the C. I.

I have said that the Dictatorship of the Proletariat is a necessary and indispensable weapon in the hands of the proletariat for the achievement of Socialism and subsequently of world Communism. This is the basic idea of the Programme, which we find worked out in detail from all aspects. In the Programme, we find only a small chapter devoted to the final goal of the Communist International, namely world Communism. In the Programme we do not find a detailed description of the Communist order of society. The main characteristics of this order of society are merely indicated. The reason for this that the Programme, being based on a scientific analysis of the present society and its dynamic social forces, does not feel itself called upon to make speculations and prophesies about the future beyond what is warranted by such an analysis. We are not utopians and we do not claim to have the detailed knowledge of the future epoch.

But the broad outlines of the future Communist society are already deducible from the trend of social and economic development in the capitalist epoch itself. These features were already indicated in the "Communist Manifesto". They have been formulated more precisely in the Programme.

Under Communism, all class antagonisms will disappear. Private property will be abolished, all means of production will be converted into social property. Conflicts inherent in the capitalist system will disappear and with them the hindrance to the growth of productive forces. Exploitation will cease and with it all social inequality. The State as an embodiment of class domination dies out as classes themselves cease to exist. Planned regulation of economy, planned organisation of scientific and technical work for the raising of the well-being of the entire humanity, the growth of a new and powerful culture, consequent on the release of human energy which up to now was taken up by unavoidable class conflicts etc, these will be some of the features of the world system of Communism, the final aim of the Communist International.

The immediate aim of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat is however Socialism, the stage which is lower than that of Communism and precedes it. World Socialism will however be undoubtedly preceded by the world dictatorship of the Proletariat. The realisation of complete Socialism will be an impossibility unless Capitalism

is overthrown everywhere in the world. Socialism is the stage which is reached towards the close of the transition period, after the progressive elimination of the capitalist elements from society under the aegis of the Proletarian Dictatorship. The socialist society, therefore just emerging from Capitalism, "bears all economic, ethical and cultural birth-marks it has inherited from the society from whose womb it is just emerging". (Programme page 20).

The advent of Socialism will not only mean the complete banishment of private ownership from all spheres of production but also that all methods of production in every sphere of human activity will have been raised to the level of large-scale methods of work based on advanced machinery and collectivism. But in spite of these industrial and technical advances achieved under the rule of the proletariat, the development of productive forces under Socialism will not have reached that level which would make the distribution of products possible under the dictum "To each according to his needs and from each according to his ability". The distribution of products shall still be in accordance to the labour expended by the individual. Therefore in the words of the Programme, "although classes are abolished, traces of class division of society and consequently remnants of Proletarian State Power, coercive laws still exist. Consequently certain traces of inequality which have not yet managed to die out altogether still remain. The antagonism between town and country has not yet been entirely removed. But none of these survivals of the former society is protected or defended by any social force". These are in brief the characteristics of the stage of Socialism.

"Socialist" and "Communist"

Before I pass on to the next important point in the Programme namely the role of the colonial revolution in the struggle for the world proletarian dictatorship, I shall make a few remarks on the use of the words "Socialist" and "Communist" which I think are necessary in this case to obviate confusion. Many times the words "Socialist" and "Communist" are used in a manner which make one believe as if there was antagonism between the two. According to our view the conceptions of Socialism and Communism are not at all opposed to each other. Socialism, in the sense of a system of society, is a stage as I have already shown which is lower than the stage of Communism and precedes it. The path of evolution, beginning from the capture of power by the proletariat leads under the aegis of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat towards Socialism and subsequently to Communism. The word "Communism" is used by us in two senses,

firstly to denote a system of society and secondly a system of thought. Fredrick Engels for the first time described it in the second sense "as the science of the emancipation of the proletariat". We define it today as the theory and practice of proletarian revolution. Communism is the theory of the capture of power by the proletariat, the theory of the dictatorship of the proletariat. This is the only path for the realisation of Socialism and subsequently Communism. "Socialism" as an alternative path towards the attainment of the socialist stage is to my mind a misnomer. It is a misnomer because the so-called "socialist" path, which is a path of class peace and constitutional progress, and which is advocated by social reformist, social democrats and "left wing Labour leaders", is a path of opportunism which does not lead to Socialism but rather to the support of Capitalism. Thus every Communist is a socialist in the truest sense of the word, in as much as he fights for Socialism in the only correct way, while those who claim to be "socialists" and out do the Prosecution and the bourgeois press in running down Communists and Communism, pursue in practice a policy which in its last analysis is in support of Capitalism and opposed to the attainment of Socialism. It is the Communists who alone are consistent socialists and not the so-called "socialists".

The C. I. and the Colonial Revolution.

If there is any single feature of the Programme of the Communist International which has enabled it to win the sympathy of the oppressed peoples of the East and which has earned for it the unmitigated hatred of the British and other Imperialists, it is this attitude of active support and solidarity with the national emancipatory movement in the East, it is its open fraternisation with the colonial people of India, China, Egypt, Indonesia, Korea etc, in their struggle against Imperialism. This point has been stressed by the Communist International from the very outset. The active support to the revolutionary struggle of the colonies and dependencies for independence from Imperialism has been made as I have already pointed out one of the twenty one conditions for admission to the C. I. The policy of the C. I. towards the colonies and the oppressed countries is diametrically opposed to that of the Second International. The Second Congress of the C. I. correctly defined the attitude of the Second International to the colonial question. It said: "The Second International failed to appreciate the importance of the colonial question. For them the world did not exist outside Europe. They could not see the necessity of coordinating the revolutionary movement of Europe with those in the non-European countries. Instead of giving the moral and material help to the revolutionary movement in the colonies, the members of the Second International

themselves became Imperialist". (P 2395 page 71). This analysis which was made in 1920 has been borne out by subsequent events. The members of the Second International have taken offices under Imperialism and have proved their capacity to act as jailors, hangmen and hired assassins loyally serving their Imperialist masters.

Now according to the Prosecution the views which the Second International holds on Labour and allied questions are quite "rational". Their views on the question of the independence of the colonies too are quite "rational", in as much as they fall in line with the Imperialist policy. Even before the war the Second International had come to hold these views. Their attitude on this question also was vitiated by the same process of degeneration into reformism and opportunism which set in in the ranks of the International before the war. It is I think necessary just briefly to indicate the growth of the inter-relations between the International Socialist Movement in the capitalist countries and the emancipatory movement in the colonies. This will enable us to see that the policy of the C. I. is not a departure from the theory and traditions of Marxian socialism, but merely a correct application of the same in terms of modern conditions of struggle. This evolution falls into three periods corresponding to the three epochs of colonial development and to the three epochs of the development of the International Socialist Movement. The first period is the epoch of the colonial penetration of early capitalism which was accompanied by unheard of brutalities and shameless murders and robbery and pillage against the colonial peoples. This period coincides with the period of Marx and Engels of the First International. The second period is the period of the maturity of Capitalism accompanied by a rapid colonial expansion, the opening up of the overseas markets and by the growth of capitalist monopoly. This period culminated in the rise of Imperialism on the one hand and of the movement of national awakening in the East on the other. During this period the leadership of the International Socialist Movement lay with the Second International.

The outbreak of the Great War marks the close of the second period and the beginning of a new one, the period of the decline of Capitalism. In the post-war period the struggle for Independence of the oppressed colonial peoples assumes a revolutionary character and becomes an important factor in the general struggle of the world proletariat for Socialism. In this period the Communist International as the unchallenged leader of the revolutionary fight for Socialism, comes out openly as the champion and the supporter of the struggle of the colonial slaves against their Imperialist masters, while the leaders of the Second International

quite openly play the role of the executors of the Imperialist policy of colonial oppression.

To deal with the first period, we naturally do not expect to find a complete formulation of the colonial question in the writings of Marx and Engels. But it is interesting to note that the contemporary events in India, China and Ireland did not escape the sharp and scientific observation of the founders of Socialism. As early as 1858 Marx devoted much study to the developments in India and China, the results of which he incorporated in the famous articles which he contributed to "The New York Tribune". In one of these articles devoted to India he stated, "in any case in the more or less distant future is to be expected with certainty a rebirth of this great and interesting country." At the same time he pointed out that this rebirth was impossible "as long as in Great Britain itself the present ruling classes are not displaced by the industrial proletariat, or the Indians themselves become sufficiently strong to shake off the British yoke once for all." ("India under the British Rule" by Karl Marx, reprinted in the "Labour Monthly" December 1925). Here we see that Marx is aware of the colonial problem although he has not yet formulated the relation between the socialist revolution in the capitalist countries and the national emancipatory struggle in the colonies. This relation was formulated by Marx a decade later when he advised the British workers to support the national movement for independence in Ireland. Explaining the Resolution of the General Council of the First International on the question of "Irish amnesty" Marx wrote "the position of the International association on the Irish question is very clear. Its first task is to accelerate the social revolution in England. To this end, the decisive blow must be struck in Ireland." ("Letters to Kugelmann", German Edition, 1927, page 21). In the same place Marx has clearly laid down that "it was the necessary pre-condition of the emancipation of the English working class to transform the slavery of Ireland into a free and equal alliance, if possible, or a complete separation if necessary." He pointed out to the English workers how the misery of the Irish proletariat was being used to lower their own standard of living.

What Marx wrote about the relation between England and Ireland holds good today on world-wide scale for the relation between the Imperialist countries and their vast colonial possessions. But Marx and Engels did not live to see the period when the chief colonial markets were opened up by force and captured by Imperialism, when the cheap labour of the distant colonial possessions was used to lower the standard of living of the workers in the capitalist countries. If they had lived to see this process they would have

surely extended their observations with reference to Ireland to a generalisation about the relation between the proletarian socialist movement in the capitalist countries and the national emancipatory struggle in the colonies.

What position did the pre-war Second International take in this matter? Did they follow up Marx's thought and recognise the duty of the workers in capitalist countries to support the resistance of the colonial peoples against Imperialist oppression? They did not. Even Karl Kautsky who was quite a radical then, declared in 1907 at the Stuttgart Congress that "the conception of colonial emancipation was a sort of a limiting idea which may show us the direction; but it is not a practical proposal, which can be immediately taken up for execution" (quoted from Comrade Ercoli's co-report in the 6th World Congress, P 1204). The pre-war Second International even in its most radical resolutions never spoke of the independence of the colonial peoples, although they condemned the methods of colonisation and proposed reforms in the Imperialist Government of the colonies. In the Paris Congress of 1900, the Second International had passed a resolution "to found socialist parties in those colonies *where economic conditions* permitted with a view to keep contact with the socialist parties of the mother country." This halting attitude of the Second International was quite in keeping with the reformist and revisionist tendencies which it was developing before the War. I have already spoken of this process in the Second International and pointed out its economic roots.

The test of the Second International and its parties came during and after the War. We have seen how they betrayed socialism by supporting the Imperialist war. Similarly when the real test came as far as the colonial question was concerned, when the nationalist movements of the oppressed people in the colonies flamed up in open mass revolts, the leaders of the Second International showed themselves in their true colours as the supporters of Imperialist oppression against the colonial peoples. The 1918 Programme of the Labour Party of England laid down that it was "against the selfish conception of "non-interference" in the affairs of the individual countries of the British Empire", that means they were for interference. And for what purpose?

"For the defence of the rights of British nationals who have over-sea interests." It further declared itself openly for the preservation of the British Empire, the community of races of different colour, creed and culture. This open and unmistakable acceptance of the Imperialist colonial policy by the premier Party of the

Second International was a fitting prelude to its subsequent record in the whole of the post-war period upto date.

Thus while the reformists of the Second International deviated from the Marxist line in the pre-war period and prepared for their subsequent going over to the Imperialist camp, there were elements inside the pre-war International which stood true to the Marxist line and worked out its further revolutionary consequences. In April 1914, Lenin in his article on "The right of nations to self-determination" clearly said that "the policy of Marx and Engels on the Irish question gave a great model, one which retains an enormous practical importance down to the present time, of what attitude the Proletariat of the oppressing nation should adopt towards the national movements". (Communist International, April 1929, page 283). The foundations of the colonial policy of the C. I. were laid in the days of Marx and Engels.

The Colonial revolution is a part of the World Revolution.

The Communist International considers the national revolutionary struggle in the colonies and semi-colonies as an integral part of the struggle for the world revolution for the establishment of a world union of Socialist and Soviet Republics. This is the basic thought in the policy of the C.I. towards the colonial question. This feature distinguishes the C.I. from the so-called Socialist and Labour parties. These parties do not recognise the need for the correlation of the struggle of the Proletariat in the capitalist countries for socialism, with the national emancipatory struggle in the colonies and semi-colonies.

Even radical "Left-wingers" of such parties, far from actively supporting the struggle for the colonial peoples against Imperialism, would rather dissuade them from such a struggle. Mr. Brailsford in his evidence before this Court expressed this view in so many words, when he said that his Party "would concede the right of India to independence if she would demand it, but would lay before her certain reasons in the hope of persuading her not to make that demand." (Deposition). The Communist International on the other hand enjoins its parties that they must recognise "the right of the colonial countries of armed defence against Imperialism, (i. e. the right of rebellion and revolutionary war) and advocate and give active support to this defence by all means in their power". (Programme, page 61).

The national emancipatory movements in the colonies and semi-colonies which began as movements of national awakening in

the pre-war period, have grown in breadth and intensity since the Great War. As I have already pointed out, one of the most important features of the period of the general crisis of capitalism is the unprecedented intensification of the conflict between the colonial and dependent countries on the one hand, and the Imperialist countries on the other. This is evidenced by the fact that a general revolutionary movement has grown in the colonial countries of the East. The movement is yearly increasing in depth and magnitude. In general terms, the basis of this growth is the increasing exploitation and oppression of the workers and peasants of the colonies. Under Imperialism the backward and colonial countries are drawn into the vortex of world economy. The gigantic raw material resources of the colonial countries are developed and exploited under the aegis of finance-capital of the various Imperialist countries. Imperialism obtains a monopolist hold on the entire economy of the colonies it controls. Because of the economic and extra-economic force which Imperialism can bring to bear upon the colonies, because of the low level of the organisation of the toiling masses there, Imperialism seeks to divert the growing pressure of its inner conflicts by seeking for an outlet in the colonies. But by so doing Imperialism does not save itself, it deepens the misery of the toiling masses in the colonies by intensifying the already unbalanced nature of the colonial economy. It merely broadens the basis for colonial unrest and revolts. Firstly, in the period of general crisis, with the growing rivalries among the Imperialist powers consequent on the narrowing of the world market, Imperialism seeks to dam and hinder the growth of industries in the colonies, which leads to the increase of pressure on land and the consequent pauperisation of the peasantry. Secondly in the general race for the reduction in the cost of production, rationalisation etc; the attack on the workers' conditions is carried out with greater brutality and thoroughness in the colonies. Thirdly as the diplomatic and political rivalries between the Imperialist powers become more acute, each Imperialist country becomes more interested in maintaining its colonial power, which places at its uncontrolled disposal enormous resources in men and material; consequently political oppression in the colonies increases.

As a result of these factors, the widespread movement of national awakening which had already begun to rise before the war, grew rapidly during the war and the post-war period, and culminated in a series of open revolts of the oppressed peoples against their foreign oppressors. The dependencies and colonies of the East in particular became one seething mass of unrest and revolt. It became clear that the colonies were the weakest link in the Imperialist

chain. The proletariat in the capitalist countries began to realise that they had to support the struggle of the oppressed nations against Imperialism, in the interests of their own emancipation from the bond of capitalism. The Communist International expressed this thought in their first authoritative statement of the Colonial question, namely in their theses on "The national and colonial question" adopted at the Second World Congress in 1920. "One of the main sources from which European capitalism draws its chief strength is to be found in the colonial possessions." The theses further go to exemplify this generalisation by taking the case of British Imperialism. "But for the extensive colonial possessions acquired for the sale of its surplus products and as a source of raw materials for her ever-growing industries, the capitalist structure of England would have been crushed by its own weight long ago. By enslaving the hundreds of millions of the inhabitants of Asia and Africa, British Imperialism succeeds so far in keeping the British Proletariat under the domination of the British bourgeoisie."

The general conclusion drawn from this is "to bring about a union of the proletariat and the working masses of all nations and countries for a joint revolutionary struggle leading to the overthrow of Capitalism, without which national inequality and oppression cannot be abolished."

The coordination and the correlation of the two streams of the world movement for socialist revolution, namely, the struggle for proletarian revolution in the capitalist countries on the one hand, and the national emancipatory struggle in the colonies and dependencies on the other, forms the basic conception which runs like a red thread through the entire theory and practice of the C.I. with reference to the colonial question. In this correlation, the existence of U. S. S. R. which is ranged on the side of the revolutionary labour movements in the capitalist countries and against Imperialism, plays an important part. In considering this correlation of the three factors of the world revolutionary movement for socialism namely (1) the revolutionary proletarian movement in the capitalist countries, (2) the struggle of the U. S. S. R. for the building up of Socialism and (3) the national revolutionary movement in the colonies, we shall have to deal with the following problems. Firstly we shall have to determine how far the national emancipatory movement in the colonies is a movement against Capitalism and thus a potential movement for socialism in those countries; secondly what form the colonial revolutionary movement will take and thus facilitate this correlation; thirdly what part the existence of the Socialist and Soviet Republics will play in determining the economic developments of the backward countries freed from the yoke of Imperialism for Socialism.

National Revolution in the Colonies anti-Imperialist.

To deal with the first point I may state at the outset that the C. I. supports the national emancipatory struggle in the colonies and in India in as much as it is anti-Imperialist, in as much as it contains potential anticapitalist elements. A genuine movement for national freedom must aim at the forcible expulsion of the foreign Imperialist oppressors, and as such must involve a conflict with a certain section of indigenous capitalist-landlord interest. This is quite a self-evident proposition. It follows that the Communists support such a national revolutionary struggle and that such struggle is in the interest of the overwhelming majority of the subject nation, which is composed of the toiling millions. The Prosecution no doubt understand these simple propositions. But they are interested in purposely distorting our views by giving currency to such epigrams as for instance "the revolution which the accused stand for is an anti-national revolution" and so on. The Prosecution are interested in showing that they are not attacking what they call "genuine nationalism" and "genuine Trade Unionism." Now, I do not know whether it was due to the successful propaganda of the Prosecution or to certain other reasons, that we soon discovered excellent protagonists of these genuine brands of nationalism and Trade Unionism in the most unexpected quarters, namely in the dock. But I shall not enter into any polemics on this question here. It has been pointed out in several previous statements of the Communist accused that the so called genuine nationalists and the genuine Trade Unionists act objectively as agents and allies of Imperialism. In the sense that the Communists stand uncompromisingly for a revolutionary struggle for national independence they are certainly not anti-national. If at all the Communists can be called anti-national it can only be done in the sense in which Professor Werner Sombart calls "proletarian internationalism anti-national." According to Professor Sombart "proletarian internationalism is anti-national in that it is opposed to everything which comes under the head of jingoism, chauvinism and Imperialism, in that it is opposed to national expansion, to all national pride, to every attempt to make bad blood between nations, to any kind of colonial policy and also to that which is regarded as the cause and effect of all these namely to military system and to war." (Sombart's "Socialism and the Socialist Movement"). In that sense we are certainly anti-national.

The Prosecution however is not interested in representing the views of the accused correctly, but rather in caricaturing them. They have attempted to create the impression that we did not stand for national independence but for the immediate establishment of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat in India which according to them is identical with the rule of Mr. Stalin. The proposition is

too absurd to need a refutation. But it may be worth while to point out that national independence, as we visualise it and as we work for it, is not opposed to the Dictatorship of the Proletariat but is merely a stage towards its attainment.

Now the C. I. has put forth direct transition to the Dictatorship of the Proletariat as "the fundamental political demand" only in the case of "countries of highly developed Capitalism (U.S.A., Germany, Great Britain etc.), having powerful productive forces, highly centralised production with small scale production reduced to relative insignificance and a long established bourgeois democratic political system." These conditions do not obtain in colonial and semi-colonial countries like India, China, Egypt etc. In these countries Industry is not sufficiently developed to serve as a basis for independent socialist reconstruction. Medieval methods still obtain largely in their system of production and are coupled with pre-capitalist forms of exploitation and oppression on land. The political system which obtains there combines the absolutism of medieval feudalism, with all the refined methods of oppression characteristic of an Imperialist colonial regime. The principal industrial, commercial and banking enterprises, the principal means of transport, plantations etc. are all concentrated in the hands of foreign Imperialism, as a result of which the whole economy in those countries is sucked dry and the toiling masses there are reduced to abject slavery, misery and poverty.

"The principal task in such countries" says the Programme, "is on the one hand to fight against feudalism and the pre-capitalist forms of exploitation and to systematically develop the peasant agrarian revolution; on the other hand to fight against foreign Imperialism for national independence".

This struggle for independence as we visualise it will be a revolutionary struggle of the toiling masses led by the proletariat, and directed in the main against the rule of foreign Imperialism. Its programme, the programme of national revolution, which has been explained in several previous statements will necessarily contain anti-capitalist elements. It is true that the success of the national revolution will not lead to the complete overthrow of Capitalism, but Capitalism will undoubtedly be unseated from the strategical position it holds today. The programme of national revolution contemplates "the confiscation and nationalisation of British factories, banks, railways, sea and river transport and plantations". Thus the commanding heights of the national economy will be wrested out of the hands of the Imperialist exploiters and concentrated in the hands of the National Government which will be a workers' and peasants' Government. The fundamental rights of

Labour will be guaranteed, the gordian knot of complex agrarian relations obtaining in the country-side will be cut by confiscating without compensation of all land, estates, forests and pastures of native princes, big landlords, moneylenders and the British Government and their transference to peasants' committees for the use of the toiling masses of the peasantry." This will involve the redistribution of land in favour of the landless and the poor peasants, the prevention of transfer of land by sale, a single steeply graded land tax. These measures will win the support of the peasantry for the National Government and will clear up the path for agricultural development along the lines of cooperation and collectivisation.

The carrying out of these measures will not yet mean the abrogation of capitalist relations in the country; but it would certainly mean a serious blow to Capitalism, because the central and the strongest support of Capitalism in the colonies, namely the Imperialist monopoly, would have gone and its place have been taken by a workers' and peasants' Government. Capitalist relations will however continue to operate, because very considerable fields of production will still be governed by individualist and small scale ownership. The subsequent economic development in a backward country freed from Imperialism, will be a bitter struggle against Capitalism. If the Workers' and Peasants' Government is able to force the pace of industrialisation, strengthen the organisation of the proletariat, cement the alliance between the proletariat and the peasantry, if it is able to enlist the active assistance of the Socialist Soviet Republics in these tasks, then alone will it be able to carry on that struggle successfully. In this sense the national independence, as we visualise it, immediately opens up the prospective for the struggle for the dictatorship of the proletariat and subsequently for Socialism.

The Role of the Colonial Bourgeoisie.

The national emancipatory movement in the colonies is characterised in the Comintern literature "as bourgeois democratic". What we mean is that the tasks which such a movement has to carry out are somewhat similar to those carried out by the bourgeois revolutions of the 18th and 19th century in Europe. The economic tasks of the agrarian revolution, which I have outlined above, namely the abolition of landlordism, serfdom and other forms of pre-capitalist exploitation and oppression are few instances of such tasks. Besides this there are other general political tasks like national unification (for instance in China), the abolition of the absolutist rule in the native states, the institution of common bourgeois democratic liberties such as freedom of speech, conscience,

press, meeting, freedom of strikes and association for toilers, abolition of all anti-popular, anti-labour laws, abolition of rank, caste, national and communal privileges, separation of religion from the State and so on. The bourgeois democratic revolutions in the colonies have got to carry out one additional task which is linked up with those enumerated above namely the overthrow of the rule of foreign Imperialism.

The bourgeois revolutions of the 18th and 19th century took place in the early dawn of Capitalism when the bourgeoisie was a rising class. The fighting forces were marshalled under the leadership of the bourgeoisie and culminated in the overthrow of feudal domination and the establishment of the rule of the bourgeoisie. In the case of the colonial revolutions, as well as in that of belated bourgeois democratic revolutions in comparatively backward independent countries which take place in the epoch of Imperialism, the bourgeois democratic tasks cannot be carried out completely by the bourgeoisie. Taking the latter case first, we can see from the experience of the first Russian Revolution of 1917 and perhaps from the recent Spanish Revolution that the bourgeoisie is incapable of carrying out bourgeois democratic tasks in their entirety in the present epoch. The reason for this is to be sought in the unequal development of Capitalism in different countries in the Imperialist epoch. The countries with highly developed Capitalism use their superior economic force to dam and hinder the capitalist and industrial development of comparatively backward countries, in order to use the same as markets for their industrial goods and as spheres of profitable investment of their surplus capital. Because of this artificial damming of industrial and capitalist development in such countries, the bourgeoisie there develops affiliations with the class of feudal exploiters, landlords, moneylenders etc. and thus becomes unable to carry out the abolition of feudal exploitation. The Russian bourgeoisie failed to carry out the agrarian revolution in 1917 against the landlords and the rich peasants. The same will happen in all probability in the case of the Spanish bourgeoisie which has come to power now in Spain.

D/24-9-31.

The same is true of the colonial bourgeoisie in a much greater degree. The colonial bourgeoisie grew up as a commercial bourgeoisie under the patronage of Imperialism. Its development to industrial bourgeoisie is hindered by Imperialism because of its set policy of hindering industrial progress excepting in its own interest. Indigenous capital was directed to land-speculation and money-lending which then became the basis of class affiliations

between the bourgeoisie and the feudal exploiting classes, (landlords, money-lenders etc.). On the other hand the Imperialists themselves are interested in preserving these feudal exploiters (native princes, landlords and money-lenders) as bulwarks against any popular rising. The colonial bourgeoisie, therefore, being weak and having these feudal ties, is unable to assert itself against the Imperialist bourgeoisie in spite of the national factor, in spite of the existence of certain economic antagonisms with Imperialism.

When we characterise the national emancipatory movement in the colonies as "bourgeois-democratic", we entertain no illusions whatsoever as to the role of the bourgeoisie in these movements. In fact Lenin in the speech at the Second Congress of the C. I. on the Colonial Thesis suggested the substitution of the expression, "bourgeois-democratic" as applied to emancipation movements in the colonies by the expression "national revolutionary". "The purport of this change," said Lenin, "is that we Communists must and will support the bourgeois emancipation movements only when these movements are generally revolutionary and when their representatives will not hinder us from educating and organising the peasantry and the vast masses of the exploited in the revolutionary spirit."

The general position of the C. I. with reference to the bourgeoisie in colonial countries is laid down in the Colonial Thesis of the Second Congress. "The foreign domination has obstructed the free development of the social forces, therefore its overthrow is the first stage towards the revolution in the colonies. So the help to overthrow the foreign rule in the colonies is not to endorse the national aspirations of the native bourgeoisie but to open the way to the smothered Proletariat there." (P 2395).

In order to realise the character and the class content of the national revolutionary struggle in the colonies and the semi-colonies, in order to be able to foresee the form which such struggle will have to adopt, which will facilitate the alliance and co-operation between the revolutionary Proletariat of advanced capitalist countries and the victorious Proletariat of the U. S. S. R. on the one hand and the struggling colonial masses on the other, it is necessary to determine the attitude of the colonial bourgeoisie towards the revolutionary movement in the colonies more precisely. The conditions which obtain in the various colonial countries are varied, and therefore a generalisation which will reduce the attitude of the bourgeoisie towards the revolutionary movements in their respective countries, to a common denominator is rather difficult. The Colonial Thesis of the 6th Congress expresses the position thus, "the position of the colonial bourgeoisie in the

bourgeois-democratic revolution is still for the most part an ambiguous one and its vacillations in accordance with the course of the revolution are even more considerable than in the bourgeoisie of an independent country (e.g. the Russian bourgeoisie in 1905-17)", (page 23 of P 1228). The factors which go to determine the degree and the direction of the vacillations of the bourgeoisie in a given country at a given movement are, firstly the objective possibilities of its compromise with Imperialism, and secondly the force and the energy of the revolutionary movement of the workers and peasants there. To deal with the first point, the question is to decide if there are objective possibilities for Imperialism to make a lasting compromise with the colonial bourgeoisie and make it a joint partner in the profits of colonial exploitation and thus win it over wholesale to the counter-revolutionary camp of Imperialism. The question was keenly discussed at the 6th World Congress in connection with the theory of "decolonisation". The economic content of the question, I think has been discussed by Comrade Spratt in his statement with reference to India. The mutual adjustment of the conflict of interest between the Imperialist and the colonial bourgeoisie based on a policy of rapid industrialisation of the colony and an increasing partnership in the colonial loot, which will afford a basis for a long and lasting compromise, is not possible inside the framework of Imperialism. As Comrade Kuusinen has pointed out in the case of India, sectional compromises are probable but not a compromise all along the line. Freedom of industrialising India in their own interest cannot be given to the Indian bourgeoisie because it would clash with the industrial interests of Imperialism. Such a development could take place without friction only if there was room enough for the exploitation of the Indian masses by the Imperialist as well as the colonial bourgeoisie to develop on parallel lines. But this is possible only if the expansion of the internal market of India could grow at a rapid pace. This would mean the rapid rise in the purchasing power of the toiling masses specially the peasantry. This is not possible under Imperialism which is forced to keep intact the entire system of precapitalist relations on land and preserve the rights and privileges of the whole strata of parasitic classes like the native princes, big landlords, moneylenders and the like. The result of this state of things is the growing fractionisation of holdings, the perpetuation of primitive methods of cultivation of land, increase in the indebtedness of the peasantry, growth in the number of landless peasants, in short a growth of an all-round pauperisation. Consequently instead of the broadening of the inner market we are witnessing a process of the narrowing down of the same due to the growing poverty of the peasant masses.

Objectively therefore there is no basis for a long and a lasting compromise between the Indian and the Imperialist bourgeoisie.

That however does not mean that the colonial bourgeoisie does not capitulate and compromise or that because of this antagonism with Imperialism it plays the role of the leader of a revolutionary struggle against Imperialism. As I have pointed out above, its affiliations with the feudal exploiting classes prevent it from playing any revolutionary role of any significance. The vacillations of the colonial bourgeoisie at a given moment are determined in the main by the second factor mentioned above, namely, the force and the energy of the revolutionary movement of the workers and peasants at that moment. In the words of the Colonial Thesis of the 6th World Congress, "the native bourgeoisie, as the weaker side again and again capitulates to Imperialism. Its capitulation however, is not final as long as the danger of a class revolution on the part of the masses has not become immediate, acute and menacing." This passage is, however, not to be interpreted to mean that the colonial bourgeoisie continues to play anything like a revolutionary role until the class revolution of the workers and peasants has broken out. On the other hand the fact that the compromise with Imperialism will not be final and lasting is stressed with a view to emphasise the danger which the bourgeoisie signifies to the revolutionary struggle of the workers and the peasants. This danger is the National Reformist Movement, which the bourgeoisie leads and which enables it to divert the energy of the petty bourgeois and peasant masses in spectacular demonstrations, and to disrupt and disorganise the forces of the revolutionary front of the toilers. As long as the bourgeoisie has not finally capitulated so long does it possess the potentialities of strutting before the masses as the opponent of Imperialism and the defender of the interests of the toilers and thus spreading reformist illusions among the masses. This danger is emphasised by the C. I. to impress upon the parties the necessity of carrying on an active struggle for the leadership of the masses against the national reformists, and their "Left" hangers-on.

NATIONAL REFORMISM Vs. NATIONAL REVOLUTION.

The Communist International recognised the existence of two basic tendencies in the nationalist movements in the colonies and semi-colonies, and formulated their respective roles as early as 1920. In the Colonial Thesis of the Second World Congress we find these two tendencies formulated as follows:—

" The one is the bourgeois-democratic-nationalist movement

with a programme of political independence under a bourgeois order, and the other is the mass action of poor and ignorant peasants and workers for their liberation from all sorts of exploitation." The same thesis points out that these two tendencies were "every day growing further apart from each other." The experience of a decade of national emancipatory struggle in the colonies, has fully confirmed in general terms this process of differentiation. In the light of this experience it was possible to formulate more precisely the significance of each tendency for the revolutionary struggle against Imperialism in the colonies. The main representative of the first named tendency is the colonial bourgeoisie or more precisely that section of the bourgeoisie which has industrial interests. The Colonial Thesis of the 6th Congress defined this tendency as "national reformist," because in the process of the struggle, it became clear that the colonial bourgeoisie which supports the nationalist movement never takes a decisive attitude towards the question of independence from Imperialism. Generally speaking its attitude is characterised by great vacillations between the revolution and a compromise with Imperialism. The depth and the degree of these vacillations as I have already said, vary in different countries, due to different historic conditions; but what is common to the colonial bourgeoisie everywhere is its mortal fear of the class revolution of the workers and peasants. In China even during the short time during which the Chinese bourgeoisie remained in the camp of the revolution its attitude was always influenced and determined by this fear. Whenever the revolutionary forces with which it had allied itself temporarily pushed the struggle forward and rose against the native exploiters, the Chinese bourgeoisie ruthlessly suppressed and sabotaged their fight. When the second tendency represented by the exploited classes took definite organisational shape, adopted the programme of national revolution against Imperialism and against the feudal exploited elements, under the leadership of the Proletariat and its Party, the Communist Party, the Chinese bourgeoisie divorced itself from the revolutionary movement and went over to the counter-revolutionary camp of Imperialism. The Chinese bourgeoisie have now turned their machine-guns against the revolutionary workers and peasants and have let loose their executioners against its leaders.

In India and Egypt the stage of an acute revolutionary mass struggle against Imperialism has not yet arrived. In the meanwhile the process of polarisation of the national reformist and national revolutionary tendencies is proceeding but at a relatively slow rate. The formation of an anti-Imperialist

national revolutionary front under the hegemony of the Proletariat has not proceeded to the stage when the class revolution of workers and peasants becomes imminent. But owing to certain historic conditions, the national reformist bourgeoisie of India is already rapidly following the footsteps of their Chinese class brothers because of their dread of the impending revolution of the workers and peasants.

They have developed a peculiar technique of a national reformist movement, which enables them, with the help of the petty bourgeois and peasant masses among which they still hold considerable influence, to disrupt and disorganise the formation of a revolutionary front against Imperialism. The Colonial Thesis of the Sixth Congress stated that "in India and Egypt the typical bourgeois nationalist movement, an opportunistic movement, subject to the vacillations was balancing between Imperialism and revolution." Today after the Civil Disobedience Movement and its sequel, today when Mr. Gandhi the accredited leader of the Movement is openly proclaiming that he is a willing prisoner of British Imperialism, we can definitely state that the balance of the nationalist reformist movement is in favour of Imperialism and dead against revolution. The national reformist movement under the leadership of the bourgeoisie is the greatest obstacle to the development of the anti-Imperialist national revolutionary front of the workers and the peasants under the leadership of the proletariat. The only tendency, therefore, which has significance today in the revolutionary struggle for the emancipation of the colonies is the second tendency as formulated in the Second Congress. The task is to find the organisational forms which will facilitate the formation of the united anti-Imperialist front of the workers and the peasants and the lower middle class under the hegemony of the working class and its Party. Only when the movement in the colonies develops along these lines, only when the united anti-Imperialist front is able to develop independent mass actions against Imperialism and under the leadership of the working class, and break the sabotage and the resistance of the bourgeoisie, will it be possible for the national emancipatory movement in the colonies to advance to the stage of the revolutionary overthrow of Imperialism.

National revolution in the colonies—a Soviet Revolution.

The conclusion we arrive at therefore is that the colonial revolution will have to be carried out against the bourgeoisie and under the leadership of the proletariat. The immediate objective towards which the Party of the Proletariat has to work is the general strike of the workers supported by a general agrarian

rising. If this revolution has to succeed, that is, if it has to carry out its bourgeois democratic tasks, the overthrow of Imperialism, the abolition of landlordism etc, it must fight not only Imperialism and the landlord class but also the bourgeoisie as well. That is, it must be, as Kuusinen has pointed out in his concluding speech on the Colonial Thesis in the Sixth World Congress, "a class revolution of the workers and the peasants—a Soviet Revolution". (P 1204).

The Prosecution will rub their hands in glee to hear this; thinking in their usual groove they will exclaim "and in the wake of this Soviet Revolution will march Mr. Stalin into India". But the "Soviet" I may explain to them is a universal form of struggle which arises at a certain stage of class struggle of the workers and the peasants. It may be that as Russia was the first country of the successful workers' and peasants' revolution the Russian name may cling to that body, even in other countries. But it is not the Russian name which matters but the organisational form which underlies it. The characterisation of the national revolution as a Soviet Revolution may appear strange even to many who stand and work for national freedom in India. They may object to the foreign word and say that such a thing is "foreign to the genius of the Indian people". But let me assure them that the organisational form which underlies the Soviet is no more foreign to the Indian workers and even to peasants in some parts. The germ from which the Soviet, as an organ of struggle arises, is to be found in the joint strike committee of the workers, which draws its representatives from all the factory and shop committees of a town or locality, and in the peasant committee which the peasants spontaneously form when they rise against their local oppressors. Every worker and peasant who has lived through a period of strike struggle and of peasant unrest knows the value of such committees as organs of struggle. It is through the experience of the same struggle that he will come to the realisation that these organs are the most suitable forms to consolidate the power of his class against the exploiters.

The strike committee is the supreme elective organ of the struggle of the working class. During the period of acute revolutionary struggle, the strike committee transforms itself into a workers' soviet which after the capture of power becomes an organ of power, in conjunction with the peasants and soldiers' soviets which are also modelled on the strike committees. The soviets of the workers, peasants and soldiers are thus the organs of "the democratic dictatorship of the workers and the peasants". The soviets, arising out of the organisational forms which have already

become familiar to the workers and peasants as the most suitable organs to carry on a struggle against their exploiters, are therefore admirably suited to develop the initiative of the masses, to lead them to create units of self-government which alone can ensure true democracy to the toilers, organs of power which alone can ensure them victory against all the exploiters. Soviets as I have already said being based on the units of production and being the elective bodies of the toilers themselves alone are in a position to create the basis for the truest and the broadest democracy for the masses.

The Democratic Dictatorship of the workers and the peasants.

While dealing with the Dictatorship of the Proletariat I pointed out that Soviets will be the organs of the same. Further I have stated that the immediate task of the revolution in the colonies is not to establish the Dictatorship of the Proletariat. It may be therefore argued that the formulation of the colonial revolution as a Soviet Revolution contradicts either of the two previous statements. The apparent contradiction disappears, when we take into consideration the fact that Soviets can serve as the basic units for the State form represented by the Dictatorship of the Proletariat as well as by "the democratic dictatorship of the workers and the peasants." Now the bourgeois-democratic tasks of the national revolution are carried out, not with the aid or assistance of the colonial bourgeoisie, but against its desire and against its resistance. The class revolution of the workers and the peasants alone will be able to carry out these tasks. The organs of struggle and power best suited to carry out this revolution and to establish a workers' and peasants' government are the Soviets. This I have already explained. What I want to stress now is that the class content of the State which will come into existence after the national revolution in a colony has become successful cannot be described as a Dictatorship of the Proletariat. The class content of such State will correspond to the State form described as "the democratic dictatorship of the workers and the peasants." It cannot be, for reasons already explained, the undivided rule of one class. The proletariat in a colonial country cannot lead the national revolution to victory without the active participation of the broad masses of the peasantry and consequently it will have to share power in the State with the peasantry. The State which will come into existence after the revolution in the colonies will be a Soviet State in form, but its class composition will not correspond to the Dictatorship of the Proletariat but to a democratic dictatorship of the workers and the peasants. The class composition of the latter is much wider than in the case of the

former. The reason is quite simple. The tasks of the colonial revolution are carried out against firstly the Imperialists and the big bourgeoisie (the Imperialist State, bankers, big industrialists, planters etc.) and secondly against the big zamindars, taluqdars, native princes, chiefs and moneylenders. In the carrying out of these tasks it is possible and essential for the proletariat to obtain the active participation of the landless peasantry, agricultural labourers as well as of an overwhelming majority of the peasantry including large sections of the rural petty bourgeoisie. Because of the backward nature of the colonial economy and because of the existence of pre-capitalist forms of exploitation and oppression the need as well as the possibility for the proletariat to rely upon the middle as well as the poor peasant masses is relatively large. The Soviet State which will consolidate the achievements of the national revolution in the colonies will have therefore a broader class basis.

The proletarian revolution in an advanced capitalist country has to be carried out mainly against the big bourgeoisie, bankers and the rural landlords and the rural bourgeoisie. The weight of the rural population is relatively negligible and that of the proletariat relatively stronger owing to the development of large scale agriculture. The rural population has been split more or less completely into a few rich farmer capitalists on the one hand and a numerous agricultural proletariat on the other. Therefore in advanced capitalist countries the industrial plus the rural proletariat with their families forms a majority. The weight of the rural and the urban petty bourgeoisie is not considerable and a large section of it can be neutralised during the struggle. Hence the proletarian revolution and its social tasks can be carried out by a single class, the Proletariat. The Soviet State in such a country after the overthrow of Capitalism can be nothing but the Dictatorship of the Proletariat.

When we describe the Soviet State, which will come into existence in a colonial country after the national revolution, as a democratic dictatorship of the workers and the peasants, it is not a contradiction in terms. Such a State is democratic as far as the workers and the peasants are concerned. Such a State realises the broadest democracy for the toilers. But at the same time it has to be remembered that it is directed against the big bourgeoisie, the landlords and the other hangers-on of the old feudal-Imperialist regime. It has to assert itself against the counter-revolutionary efforts of these classes; it has to be ruthlessly dictatorial against them. Hence the expression "democratic dictatorship" is not a contradiction in terms but is full of meaning.

The Soviets and the Panchayats.

I may stress here one more point in connection with the nature and the historical role of the Soviets. There has been a tendency in India to associate the traditional and supposedly democratic institutions known as the Panchayat, especially the village Panchayat, with the Soviet and to declare that they amount to the same thing. Nothing could be farther from the truth. In the first place, as I have shown, the Soviets arise only in certain historical circumstances. Only when the class struggle of the masses has reached a point of such depth and intensity that the seizure of power can be considered as a practical possibility, do the masses begin to develop their strike committees and peasants committees into Soviets. The Soviets are the organs of revolutionary struggle and revolutionary State power of the masses. Organisations even similar in structure to the Soviets cannot be called Soviets if they do not perform this historical function. But the forms of organisation of the Soviet and the Panchayat are totally different. The Soviet even after the revolution, when it has become part of the organisation of the State, is formed on a class basis. The Panchayat on the other hand has a caste basis. The village Soviet is elected in a general meeting of all the village population, except the exploiters. The Panchayat is appointed by the separate castes of the village, which usually, in accordance with the tradition, appoint the most influential and therefore the richest members of their caste. The Panchayat therefore becomes an organisation of the village exploiters, the organ of power of the oppressors.

I have said that Soviets as organs of struggle and power develop out of strike and peasant committees. That however does not mean that a strike committee or a peasant committee organised for the purpose of a partial struggle is identical with a Soviet or can immediately grow over into a Soviet. The strike committees and the peasant committees are transformed into Soviets only when the general situation in the country has become acutely revolutionary. The relation between the strike committee and the Soviet has been stressed in order to point out that these organisational forms which are familiar even to the workers and the peasants of backward countries are "the preparatory elements of the coming Soviets."

The Soviets and the Constituent Assembly.

Now before we come to the stage^d of forming the Soviets, and of the seizure of power through the Soviets, the Communist Parties shall have to do a lot of preparatory work in the organisations of

workers and peasants. They shall have to seek and evolve various organisational forms which may enable the masses to create the popular instruments of the seizure of power. Here I should like to raise answer to the question whether the agitation for the election of "the Constituent Assembly" is suited to be the preparatory activity in the process of "creating a democratic organ of struggle for power". I shall deal with this question only with reference to India. This slogan has been recently shouted by a few representatives of a section of the bourgeoisie and the petty bourgeoisie in India, who have come to adopt a semi-revolutionary phraseology and have talked not only of complete independence but of seizure of power. Further the Workers' and Peasants' Party itself had adopted this slogan in 1927 but dropped it later on at the end of 1928. I shall briefly deal with this question and point out why the Constituent Assembly is not suited to be the instrument of the seizure of power for a workers' and peasants' revolution in India.

The historical roots of the Constituent Assembly lie as far back as the French Revolution. In the classical bourgeois revolutions of the 19th century the bourgeoisie which rose to power through the assistance of the exploited classes of the old feudal society, in some cases created an organ of democratic power called the Constituent Assembly. This was a national body elected on the basis of adult suffrage, whose function it was to formulate the constitution and the rights and liberties of the people. The Constituent Assembly played an important part in the French Revolution. It was convened by the victorious bourgeoisie to consolidate its victory over feudalism. The Constituent Assembly of the French Revolution, historically speaking, inaugurated the epoch of bourgeois democracy and Parliamentarism.

History has taught us that the democratic achievements of the bourgeoisie which certainly marked advance in their time over feudal absolutism, soon proved to be hollow from the point of view of the toiling masses. The bourgeois Parliaments became organs of bourgeois dictatorship. The thesis on 'Democracy and Dictatorship' of the Second Congress of the Communist International puts this point clearly: "During the previous epoch, Parliament had performed a certain progressive function as the weapon of developing capitalism. But under the present conditions of unbridled Imperialism Parliament has become a tool of falsehood, deceit, violence and enervating gossip. In the face of Imperialistic devastation, plunder, violation, robbery and ruination, Parliamentary reforms devoid of system of consistency of definite plan have lost every significance for the working masses." (P 2395, pages 42, 43).

Bourgeois democratic revolutions in the present epoch, which is characterised by the decline of capitalism, cannot lead the

toiling masses to freedom and democracy through Parliamentarism. This has been amply proved by the lessons of the Russian Revolution. The slogan of the Constituent Assembly which was raised by the bourgeoisie immediately after the success of the first revolution was a device on their part to consolidate the power of the bourgeoisie by the help of a Parliamentary system. The bourgeoisie could not satisfy the elementary demands of the masses for freedom, democracy, peace and bread. The actual organisations of the toiling masses, the councils of workers' deputies and the peasants and soldiers' committees, which were the actual organs of struggle and had been responsible for the overthrow of the Czarist autocracy, were thrust aside and their demands ignored. The first revolution was unable to complete even the bourgeois democratic tasks of the revolution. Only the November Revolution was able to complete these tasks and open the road to social revolution.

This is the mode of development of the bourgeois revolution and of the Constituent Assembly, its organ. Thus history shows that the Constituent Assembly is principally an organ of the consolidation of the power of the bourgeoisie (under the cover of democracy) after the revolution. It is in any case essentially a bourgeois institution, of the Parliamentary type. Its employment in any given case therefore presupposes in the first place that the bourgeoisie is the class which leads the revolution, or at any rate that the bourgeoisie takes part in the revolution. Now in India this is not the case. It has been shown at length in a previous statement that the essential character of the bourgeoisie in India is non-revolutionary, and actually, as the revolution develops, ultimately counter-revolutionary. This alone determines that the Constituent Assembly has no place in the history of the Indian revolution.

But although it is essentially an organ of the bourgeoisie, the working class can in certain circumstances support the demand for the Constituent Assembly as did the Bolshevik Party for a certain period during the revolution. Lenin justified this demand in the following words:—

“The demand for summoning of a Constituent Assembly formed in the past a perfectly legitimate part of the programme of the revolutionary social democracy, because in a bourgeois Republic the Constituent Assembly constitutes the highest form of democracy, and because the Imperialist Republic with Kerensky at its head in creating a Parliament was preparing an adulteration of the elections accompanied by numerous infractions of democracy.” (Lenin, “the Proletarian Revolution,” page 144).

The Workers' and Peasants' Parties have from time to time placed before the Indian National Congress the slogan of a Constituent Assembly. In its Manifesto to the Madras Session of the Congress, the Workers' and Peasants' Party says, "The National Constituent Assembly guaranteeing complete national independence and the democratisation of national life in every respect, this must be the main plank of the Congress platform." (P 23).

The Indian National Congress was then making its first historic gesture as the champion of Indian Independence. A resolution demanding complete National Independence was for the first time passed at the Madras Session. But was the Workers' & Peasants' Party correct in estimating that bourgeois nationalism was proceeding to a militant struggle for independence? Or was bourgeois Nationalism "preparing an adulteration of elections accompanied by numerous infractions of democracy?" Subsequent events showed that the bourgeoisie was preparing for an "All Parties' Conference" to outline a scheme of Dominion Status as a counterpoise to the Simon Commission. Its Independence resolution was to turn into Dominion Status resolution the next year. The renewed gesture of independence at the Lahore Congress, the mock heroics of some of the Congress leaders who talked of "the Capture of power," were preludes to a mass reformists struggle which was carried on with one eye on the possibilities of a suitable compromise with Imperialism and the other eye on the best means of holding the mass revolutionary movement in check, and which has ultimately led to an abject capitulation of its leaders to British Imperialism. The Nationalist bourgeoisie has proved that it is not only incapable of leading the national revolution, but that it is fast developing an elaborate technique for preventing and opposing the same. The class which expects to obtain "the substance of independence" in a Round Table Conference with Imperialists cannot be accepted to take the slogan of a Constituent Assembly very seriously, a slogan which has sense and meaning only in the eventuality of the capture of power by the bourgeoisie.

The workers' and the peasants' parties realised the anti-revolutionary character of the national bourgeoisie early enough. If they wanted any convincing, the retreat of the Congress after its demonstration at the Madras Session to the All Parties Conference was sufficient to convince them that the national bourgeoisie was not capable of pursuing a revolutionary policy. At the end of that year, at the All India Workers' and Peasants' Party Conference, the slogan of the Constituent Assembly was dropped.

Today this slogan is as unreal and divorced from actual

conditions as it was in 1928. This slogan can have no meaning in a bourgeois reformist movement, in which the bourgeoisie is scheming to gain a few concessions through reformist channels. At best it can be the slogan of a revolutionary bloc of the bourgeoisie, the workers and the peasants. Is such a revolutionary bloc against Imperialism possible in India? It has been shown that it is not. The slogan may attract certain of the petty bourgeois intellectuals. But again these are a class who are not able to lead the mass revolution. If we were to set out with the ideas of delivering the movement over into the hands of the petty bourgeoisie, and therefore ultimately into those of the treacherous and anti-revolutionary bourgeoisie, we should go about it by starting the movement with the slogan of the Constituent Assembly. The slogan has no meaning for the masses. It is totally unsuited to a mass movement led by the working class, as the national revolutionary movement in India must be. The revolutionary bloc which will carry through the national revolution in India is that of the workers and the peasants and the other exploited classes. These classes can only depend upon their own mass organisations, not upon the parliamentary forms of the bourgeoisie. They will work for the formation of strike committees and peasant committees which, as the struggle will develop, will expand into the Soviets.

The formation of the Soviets is not the immediate task in India. The revolutionary struggle has not yet developed to that pitch. But it is the duty of the Party of the Proletariat to show its allies the pitfalls of bourgeois democracy and of bourgeois pseudo-revolutionary methods of struggle, and to make clear to them the necessity of the development of their own mass organisations into organs of struggle and power. The Constituent Assembly is as Lenin said, "the highest form of democracy possible under a bourgeois republic."

But India will not see this stage. The Indian revolution will proceed directly to the still higher democratic form, the Soviet of the workers and the peasants.

The path of the backward colonies to Socialism.

I have laid special emphasis on the Soviet character of the national revolution in the colonies, because this form is eminently suited to the growing over of the bourgeois democratic revolution into the socialist revolution. Further this form will facilitate the correlation of the two main forces of the world revolutionary movement for socialism, namely the revolutionary proletarian movement of the capitalist countries, and the struggle of the victorious proletariat of the U.S.S.R. for Socialism, with the national revolutionary movements in the colonies. Finally if

this correlation can be successfully achieved, the path of the backward colonies to Socialism need not have to pass through the intermediary stage of a painful capitalist development.

Firstly I must explain what we mean by "growing over" of the bourgeois democratic revolution into the socialist revolution. According to the classical picture given by Marx of the development of society, "the bourgeois-democratic revolutions are carried out against the feudal order, and create the pre-conditions for the development of Capitalism. Industrial development, the process of elimination of the small producers, the centralisation of production etc. takes place under Capitalism giving rise to the division of society into the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. This development is accompanied by the growth of the fundamental conflicts of Capitalism which lead to the socialist revolution. The question then arises, is this classical picture also to be applied to the bourgeois-democratic revolutions which take place in the backward colonies in the present epoch of the decline of Capitalism? Has the industrial and economic development which will take place after the overthrow of the foreign Imperialist rule to proceed simultaneously with a development of Capitalism, which then in its turn has to reproduce its conflicts, leading after a fairly long period to the socialist revolution? Have the backward colonies, after being freed from foreign Imperialism, to wade through a fairly long and painful period of capitalist development before they come to the socialist revolution? The question has been in essence answered by Marx himself. With reference to the destinies of backward countries like Russia, Marx has expressed the view that the development in these countries need not necessarily follow the scheme of the classical development of Capitalism. Other historical conditions may alter the picture. Lenin gave later on a more specific answer to the question. In the Colonial Thesis of the Second Congress of the Communist International he laid down that "the masses in the backward countries may reach Communism, not through capitalist development but led by the class conscious proletariat of the advanced countries."

The perspective which Lenin here visualises signifies that the industrial development which takes place in a colony freed from Imperialism need not be accompanied by a development of Capitalism. The process of the disappearance of the small producer and the petty proprietor which necessarily accompanies industrialisation will not lead to the growth of the capitalist, concentrating ever-increasing means of production in his hands. On the other hand small-scale production will disappear, giving place directly to a large-scale production with a collective ownership, that is the

backward economy of the colonies will develop directly into Socialism avoiding the stage of capitalist development. In other words the bourgeois-democratic revolutions in the colonies will not be followed by a stage of capitalist development, accompanied by the strengthening of the bourgeois class, which then has to be overthrown by the proletariat through a socialist revolution. These revolutions will be followed by a stage in which the surviving elements of capitalist and pre-capitalist economy will be progressively and peacefully transformed into the elements of socialist economy. That is what we mean when we say that the bourgeois-democratic revolution will "grow over into the socialist revolution".

But we have to bear it in mind that Lenin had expressed this in the form of a perspective and not a prophesy. We shall have to consider the factors whose existence today makes such a perspective most likely. Firstly the colonial revolutions of the present period are taking place in the epoch of the decline of Capitalism and of a general crisis. This period as I have shown is characterised by a general narrowing of the world market, by the sharpening of economic and diplomatic rivalries between the Imperialist Powers, and finally by the intensification of the political and economic pressure of Imperialism on the colonies. This is at the same time being accompanied by the consolidation of the socialist base of the revolutionary proletariat in the U. S. S. R., as well as by the growing antagonism between the U. S. S. R. and the principal capitalist countries of the world. The colonial revolutions, if they have to carry out their anti-Imperialist and anti-feudal task, have no other alternative than to ally with the force which is pitched against Imperialism, namely the U. S. S. R. The colonial bourgeoisie, being torn between its economic antagonism with Imperialism, its affiliations with the feudal exploiting strata, and its mortal fear of the class revolution of the workers and the peasants, vacillates between the camp of revolution and the camp of Imperialism. If under special historic circumstances it remains for a time in the camp of the revolution and seeks the alliance of the proletariat of the U. S. S. R., it very soon finds the forces of class revolution of the workers and the peasants growing very rapidly under its feet. It is forced to leave the revolutionary front, to become actively counter-revolutionary, join the camp of Imperialism and become openly hostile to the Soviet Union. This is exactly what happened in China. The Chinese Bourgeoisie remained in the camp of revolution during the years 1925-1926 and sought and obtained the assistance of the Soviet Union in its struggle against Imperialism. But no sooner it saw the revolutionary movement of the workers and the peasants grow and display strong anti-capitalist and anti-landlord tendencies than it became

actively counter revolutionary. It merged itself into the Imperialist camp and became actively hostile to the Soviet Union and went so far as to provoke and open a serious conflict with the U. S. S. R. on the issue of the Eastern Chinese Railway at the end of 1929. Thus in the present period when the conflict between the Imperialist Powers and the Soviet Union on the one hand, and that between Imperialism and the colonies on the other, is deepening, it becomes all the more necessary to effect an alliance between the forces of colonial revolution and the Soviet Union. Such alliance can be effected only when the national emancipatory movements in the colonies outgrow the tutelage of the native bourgeoisie, when the national revolution in the colonies rises to the stage of a class revolution of workers and peasants, when it becomes a Soviet Revolution.

If the alliance with the Soviet Union is necessary during the development of the national emancipatory movement in a colony to the stage of Soviet Revolution, that alliance and assistance will be far more necessary after the victory of the revolution which has freed that colony from Imperialism. In fact the active assistance of an advanced Soviet Republic, with the rich experience in solving the problem of transforming an industrially backward country with almost primitive peasant economy into a country of rapid industrial growth and planned socialist economy, will be the only guarantee for the possibility of a non-capitalist development of a colony freed from Imperialism. The Soviet Union has demonstrated in practice the solution of a problem which is of fundamental importance for the non-capitalist development in such colonies. That problem is the establishment of a link between the nationalised industry and the individual peasant husbandry freed from feudal domination, which will enable a rapid industrialisation on the one hand and the transference of agriculture to a higher stage of large scale production based on productive cooperation and collectivisation. This is exactly the problem with which a new-born Soviet India or Soviet China will be faced. With the prospect of the Soviet Union carrying through its Five Year Plan and gaining daily in strength, its ability to materially help a colony freed from Imperialism in this direction increases, and with it the perspective of the development of that colony to Socialism avoiding the stage of Capitalism becomes more likely.

D/ 25.9.31

There is another factor which is important in connection with this perspective, and that is the victorious Proletarian revolutions in the advanced capitalist countries. In the period of general crisis characterised by colonial revolts, the growth of the Soviet Union, the sharpening of International rivalries and the growing

danger of an Imperialist World War, the prospect of Proletarian revolutions in the Imperialist countries themselves becomes ever more likely. If the Proletariat in such a country like Great Britain, America, Holland, France etc. were to become victorious, this will not only assist the process of bringing about a national revolution in their respective colonies, but also open up the possibilities for these emancipated colonies to develop rapidly towards socialism, directly, without undergoing a capitalist development. The victory of the Proletariat in an Imperialist centre with highly developed industry, will signify the disappearance of the deep economic contradictions which exist today between the Imperialist economy in the mother country and the colonial economy, which is based on the existence of the Imperialist monopoly, and which is the source of the exploitation of the Proletariat at home and of the colonial masses abroad. A planned co-operation between the highly developed metropolitan industry and the backward, predominantly agricultural, economy of the former colonies will be possible, leading to the rapid strengthening of the nationalised industry in the latter, and to the transformation of agricultural economy based on individual peasant production, into a higher stage of large scale production based on collective ownership. That such a cooperation is possible and feasible, that it leads to the rapid raising of the standard of living of the proletarians in the industrial metropolis on the one hand and of the toiling masses of the backward rural periphery, and to the growth of planned socialist economy, has been practically demonstrated on a small scale on the soil of the U. S. S. R. Such a development can be visualised on a grand scale when a cooperation between "the world city", the industrial centres of the former Imperialist countries under proletarian leadership, becomes possible with "the world village", the backward "colonial" periphery under the Soviet rule of its workers and peasants. Thus "the possibility of a non-capitalist path of development for the backward colonies, the possibilities of the "growing over" of the bourgeois democratic revolution in the leading colonies into the Proletarian Socialist revolution, with the aid of the victorious Proletarian Dictatorship in other countries", can be visualised.

It is necessary to emphasise once again that before such a cooperation is possible, before such a perspective becomes a reality, it is essential that the colonial revolution has already risen to the pitch of a class revolution of workers and peasants, a Soviet revolution, and has completely smashed the resistance and the sabotage of the native bourgeoisie. As long as the influence of the colonial bourgeoisie over the toiling masses is not completely destroyed, so long is there always a possibility of the native bourgeoisie carrying out a bloody counter-revolution against the revolutionary workers

and peasants and establishing itself in the saddle again. But it has to be remembered that the native bourgeoisie being weak can only carry out such a counter-revolution with the active assistance of the Imperialists. The counter-revolution in reality reestablishes, though temporarily, Imperialism in the saddle and not the native bourgeoisie. The success of the counter-revolution therefore does not open the prospect of an independent capitalist development under the rule of the native bourgeoisie, but that of the continuation of the old feudal-Imperialist regime. The counter-revolution merely delays the "bourgeois-democratic" revolution which can only be achieved by a Soviet revolution. This is exactly what has happened in China. The "independent" National Government of Chang-Kai-Shek is nothing else but a tool of Imperialism. It has not been able to break the power of the feudal militarists which reign supreme in the hinterland, it has not been able to abolish landlordism and free the peasant masses from the yoke of pre-capitalist exploitation. It cannot assert itself against Imperialism and carry out an independent industrial development (Tariff, Currency etc. being still firmly controlled by foreign Imperialism). The counter-revolution in China has delayed the carrying through of the bourgeois democratic tasks which will be carried out in their entirety only by an all-round Chinese Soviet Revolution.

The conclusion is that the development of the national revolution in the colonies to Soviet revolution is a necessary precondition for the future development of the colonial peoples to Socialism, avoiding the stage of capitalist development. Now the peculiar class relations which obtain in a colonial country, and especially the relations obtaining between the native bourgeoisie, the feudal exploited strata and Imperialism are such that the national revolution, if it is to be successful against Imperialism, will have to be a Soviet revolution. Further the International factors favourable to the ripening of a Soviet revolution in the colonies, its success and subsequent consolidation are getting stronger day by day. These factors are the existence of the U. S. S. R. and the growing revolutionary proletarian movement in the capitalist countries. Considering all these factors and their mutual interactions, we can say that today we are nearer to the realisation of the perspective visualised by Lenin than 12 years back when Lenin first formulated it. The Colonial thesis of the 6th World Congress reiterates this perspective in the following words :—

"The alliance with the U. S. S. R. and with the revolutionary Proletariat of the Imperialist countries, creates for the toiling masses of China, India and all other colonial and semi-colonial countries, the possibility of an independent, free, economic and

cultural development, *avoiding the stage of the domination of the capitalist system* or even the development of capitalist relations in general". (P. 1228, page 8). The Communist International however looks upon this as a perspective which is being made more and more likely in the present period and not as a prophecy, the fulfilment of which it awaits with folded hands. It declares in the Colonial Thesis of the 6th Congress that "under favourable conditions this possibility is converted into reality, whereby the true path of development is determined by *struggle* and by struggle alone."

The Communist international therefore seeks consciously to correlate and coordinate the forces of the revolutionary Proletariat in the capitalist countries, and of the victorious Proletariat in the U. S. S. R. in order to actively assist the revolutionary movement of national emancipation in the colonies and to carry on the struggle for the realisation of Socialism, both in the capitalist as well as in the colonial countries. It has enjoined the Communist Parties of the capitalist countries to establish "close, regular and constant relations with the revolutionary movement in the colonies for the purpose of affording these movements active support and immediate practical help". (P. 1228, page 60). It has called upon them to organise mass demonstrations of the Proletariat in their countries in support of that struggle. It has impressed upon these parties the need "to mobilise the wide masses of workers and peasants in the capitalist countries on the basis of the demand for granting unconditional and without reservation, complete State ~~and~~ independence and sovereignty to the colonial peoples." It exhorts its Constituent parties to open war on the "Left" socialist phrasemongers of the I. S. I. who assist in the disruption of the revolutionary movement in the colonies by their fraternisation with the national reformist bourgeois leadership in the colonies and spread illusions among the Proletariat of their countries that the capitalist colonial régime can be transformed into "a good colonial régime" by the granting of reforms etc. (The attitude of the I. L. P. towards the Round Table Conference etc.).

The Communist International has done something more than passing resolutions and theses during the last ten or 12 years of its existence. Its record of active support to the revolutionary colonial movements, although not adequate according to its own admission, (P. 1228, page 60), has been sufficient to bring down upon its head the bitterest enmity and the most ruthless persecution at the hands of the Imperialists and their hangers-on. Some outstanding instances of such activities may be cited.

During the onward march of the revolutionary wave in

China in 1925-27, the Communist Party of Great Britain organised a "Hands off China" Campaign and made active propaganda against the sending of war-ships and troops to shoot down the Chinese workers. Similar demonstrations were organised on the continent. The Proletariat of the Soviet Union rendered more active help to the revolutionary forces. The C. I. guided and led the young Chinese Communist Party in its bitter struggle against Imperialism and against the counter-revolutionary forces of Chang-Kai-Shek. If to-day a few millions of the Chinese peasants have been able to organise their own Soviets and hold their own in a bitter conflict against Chang-Kai-Shek and the Imperialist bandit it is undoubtedly due to the fact that the Proletariat of the U. S. S. R. under the leadership of the C. I. has been able to throw in its weight in this conflict against the forces of Imperialism.

Another example is the action of the working class of France in 1924-1925 during the wars waged by French Imperialism against the risings of the colonial population in Syria and Morocco. Neither of these movements was a proletarian movement. The population in both the cases is backward and hardly any bourgeois class has yet developed there. Nonetheless these movements were genuinely revolutionary and the French working class, led by its Communist Party and the C. G. T. U., waged a brilliant campaign of demonstrations and strikes in sympathy with them against the French Government. About a million workers were involved in these strikes.

These two examples will suffice to show that the attitude of the C. I. towards the revolutionary movements in the colonies is one of open and active supports. The Left-wingers of the L. S. I. on the other hand not only do not support such movements but attempt to disrupt them by creating reformist illusions among the proletariat in their own countries as well as in the colonies. The attitude of the C. I. on the colonial question is in keeping with the best traditions of the former Internationals, which were of an uncompromising struggle for Socialism and against Capitalism. The L. S. I. on the other hand has deserted the camp of revolution and Socialism and has become an open instrument of Imperialism against colonial revolts. The only "rational" attitude towards the colonial question from the point of view of the genuine International movement for Socialism is the one taken by the Communist International.

International class discipline.

I have dealt with the salient points of the Programme of the

C. I. with a view to give an idea of the role it plays and is bound to play in the future in the movement for the emancipation of humanity from all exploitation, in the movement for world Socialism. I have not dealt with the problems arising out of the strategy and tactic of the C. I. except in the most general terms as they arose in discussing the difference between the C. I. and the Second International, and I do not propose to do so. I should however like to mention just one point before I conclude this section. The Prosecution alleged that the policies of our Parties were dictated from Moscow, I suppose by the "Moscow clique". Your Honour has also used this allegation to justify the gravity of the present "conspiracy". This allegation has also been put forward, I do not know whether as defence or offence, by Mr. Kishori Lal Ghosh in his statement. He says in his statement, "but the difficulty of the Communists is that as a party they have to implicitly obey the instructions of the centre, which is situated thousands of miles away from their spheres of activities." No doubt Mr. Ghosh has the "Moscow clique" at the back of his mind when he makes that statement. This agreement in view between the representatives of the Imperialist Government and a supporter, sympathiser or a representative, I do not know which, of the L. S. I. is to me not at all surprising. Mr. Brailsford put his views on the matter in a negative form and probably administered a hidden rebuke to the C. I. He said in his deposition before this Court, "the Second International itself dictates no policy to its constituent Parties in countries other than those with long democratic traditions. Indeed it does not dictate to any one".

The position of the C. I. on this question is clearly laid down in its Programme. The C. I. seeks to coordinate and correlate the revolutionary forces of the proletariat throughout the world. In order to achieve this task it must have unity, uniformity of action and above all International class discipline in the Communist ranks. It says, "This International class discipline must find expression in the subordination of partial and local interests of the movement to its general and lasting interests, and in the strict fulfilment by all the members of the decisions passed by the leading bodies of the C. I."

"The decisions passed by the leading bodies of the C. I.", it will be argued are exactly what are called "the dictates of the "Moscow clique". Now this is not so. The leading bodies for the most part contain representatives from the various countries, elected at the Congress, and are in close contact with the affiliated parties. The general line of the policy of the C. I. is decided upon in the Congress which is the highest organ of the C. I., and is composed

of the delegates from all affiliated parties. The decisions of the leading bodies which function in the interim period between two successive Congresses are concerned merely with the execution of the line adopted at the last Congress, and even these decisions affecting the various countries are based on detailed knowledge of the struggle and conditions obtaining in those countries and supplied by their Communist Parties. Thus the question of dictation, of imposing decisions does not arise. The whole machinery of the C. I. and its parties works on the principle of "democratic centralism", a principle which I may remind the supporters of the L. S. I. in the dock was enunciated by Marx and formed the basis of the organisation and structure of the First International.

The Social Democratic International, which "dictates to no one", has also a discipline, a discipline which functions within each national section, a discipline which functions in favour of "its own" national bourgeoisie. The German Social Democratic Party for instance enforced discipline against its parliamentary members, who refused to vote for the grant for the building of a new warship. It enforced discipline against the members who revolted against the policy of "tolerating" the dictatorship of Herr Brüning. The L. S. I. "indeed dictates to no one", for the most simple reason that it will not correlate the national forces of the proletariat for an international action against Capitalism, but its sections do dictate to its followers and subject them to a discipline in the service of the bourgeoisie.

In this connection I may mention one more point. It has been stated that the Russian Communist Party dominates in the Communist International and subjects all other parties to its dictation. Undoubtedly the C. P. S. U. is the largest and the most advanced section of the C. I. and as such certainly wields a proportionate influence in the C. I. It is the section which has led the proletariat to victory and is today successfully leading it to Socialism. It concentrates within its ranks the most valuable revolutionary experience, and as such it is certainly the most powerful factor in the C. I. If that is domination, then I may point out that a similar domination also exists within the L. S. I. The British Labour Party can be said to dominate over the other sections of the L. S. I. Thus against the C. I. "dominated" by the C. P. S. U., a party which has led the proletariat to victory against Capitalism in one country, which has emancipated the oppressed nationalities from the yoke of Czarist Imperialism, stands the L. S. I. dominated by the British Labour Party with its black record of treachery to the Socialist Movement, and of complicity in the brutal suppression of colonial revolts in the service of Imperialism. As members of a

oppressed nation, striving for independence from Imperialism, we shall undoubtedly stand by the Comintern even if it were "dominated" by the C. P. S. U.

Conclusion.

I have come to the conclusion of the explanation or justification or whatever you may like to call it of my being a member of the Communist Party of India. The charge of conspiracy is raised against me not for any acts overt or otherwise, which I have committed as a member of the C. P. I. There are no acts at all. I am merely charged because I was a member of the Party. The nature of the present case is such that the question of defending the individual does not arise. The question is to defend the Party, its ideology, its right to exist, its right to affiliate to and be assisted by the Communist International. If I have dealt with the Communist International at length—although I personally think I have been very brief and left out many points untouched—it is because the Prosecution has made it the central figure in this case. It is because they have made it the arch-conspiratorial body and placed it on trial. We as Communists feel it our duty to defend it before the Court and the public and place Imperialism and Capitalism on trial. The Prosecution have hurled the vilest abuse on Communism, Communists and the Communist International. They have said that our crime is not merely against the State but against society as a whole. I shall treat their abuse with the contempt it deserves but hurl back the charge of being criminals against human society as a whole, in the teeth of the Imperialists and their highly-paid agents themselves. Who are the social criminals, I ask, the blood-thirsty Imperialists who carried fire and sword through entire continents, who have instituted a colonial regime of blood and terror, who have reduced the toiling millions of these continents to abject poverty, intolerable slavery and are threatening them with mass extinction as a people; or the Communists, who are out to mobilise the revolutionary energies of the toiling masses of the whole world and hurl it against this wretched system based on ruthless oppression and brutal exploitation, smash it and create in its place a new one and thus save human society and its civilisation from the catastrophe towards which it is undoubtedly heading? The official representatives of social criminals in this case are sitting on the Prosecution benches.

The Communist International, as I have shown is the result of the organic growth of a century of international Labour Movement. It is the heir to the revolutionary traditions of the two Internationals which preceded it. Relying on the experience of decades of proletarian struggle, the Communist International is

today leading the revolutionary Labour Movement for Socialism in the capitalist countries, wielding strong influence on the National Revolutionary Movement in the colonies against Imperialism, and finally directing and guiding the actual building up of Socialism in one-sixth part of the globe. It is the achievements of the Communist International in this last-named field, which is responsible for its growing power and influence in the eyes of the proletarians of the capitalist countries, and for its increasing influence over the toiling millions of the oppressed colonial nations.

The existence of the U. S. S. R. is today a mighty support for the International Workers' Movements led by the Comintern. From this base the Communist International will continue to operate in conjunction with the proletarian masses of the advanced countries and with the hundreds of millions of the colonial toilers against Capitalism and Imperialism and bring about their final overthrow.

The Communist International is today a gigantic factor in world's history, a factor which will reshape the destiny of human society and its civilisation and save it from the catastrophe with which it is threatened under the present system.

I may express this thought in the words of the programme of the 5th Congress (P 2398, page 17). "From out of the chaos and the misery, out of the falling debris of decaying capitalism, out of the mad and monstrous new wars in which the bourgeoisie is ready to destroy millions of workers, and the last remnants of its own culture—out of all this the Communist International will lead humanity on to a new path from the depths of death and destruction to Communism."

But the wretched agents of the bourgeoisie will not understand this, to them the Communist International is a secret conspiracy which has to be stamped out with the aid of a section of the Penal Code. Their thoughts have always moved in the same groove. Sixty years back the same accusations were hurled at the First International. Sixty years back **Marks** answered these accusations on behalf of the International. The words which he wrote in the Manifesto on the Paris Commune ("Civil War in France", D. 409, page 47) are as true today as they were 60 years back. I think I could not do better than close this section with those words.

"The Police-tinged bourgeois mind, naturally figures itself the International Working men's Association as acting in

the manner of a secret conspiracy, its central body ordering from time to time explosions in different countries. Our association is in fact, nothing but the International bond between the most advanced workmen in the various countries of the civilised world. Wherever and in whatever shape and under whatever conditions the class struggle obtains consistency, it is but natural that the members of our association should stand in the foreground. The soil out of which it grows is modern society itself. It cannot be stamped out. To stamp it out, the Government would have to stamp out the despotism of Capital over Labour—the condition of their own parasitic existence.”

My Membership of the C. P. I.

I joined the C. P. of India some time after I joined the W. P. P. Bombay. I do not know anything about P 1170, 1171, 1172, 1173, and 1168. I cannot be expected to know anything about P 1295, 1297, and 1300.

My Membership of the W. P. P.

I was a member of the W. P. P. Bombay at the time of my arrest. I joined the Party because it aimed at the complete independence of India from Imperialism through revolution. During the hundred days of freedom I had in India I did not have much opportunity of doing any work for the Party. My work was mainly restricted to study and observation.

I have nothing to say about the exhibits P 1343, 1344, 1345, 1357, 1353, 1373 (1) and P 1211.

Communist Literature found in my Possession.

• The Magistrate has stated that many books on Communism were found in my possession (Committal Order page 197). I have already dealt with the Sea Customs Search and pointed out how pitiful were its results. No literature was seized from my residence in Thakurdwar Road excepting a few copies of 'Spark'. The searches in the "Kranti" Office were carried out with the same pigheadedness on the part of the Police officials which we meet with in the rest of the searches in this case of ^{my} fact in all the political searches in India. Scientific works by Professor Planck, Einstein, and other literary works were seized. I experienced considerable difficulty in getting these books returned to me, as it was not an easy job to convince the Prosecution of the fact that the theory of relativity was not yet bound by an ordinance of the British Government in India. (See P 2529 which gives translation of the titles of books in

P 1200). Perhaps the Prosecution regard Professor Albert Einstein as some sort of a co-conspirator in this case as his name appears in the list of the Honorary Presidents of the league against Imperialism (See P 1832, copy of the Statutes of the League).

With reference to the books, journals and magazines, and newspapers found in the "Kranti" Office I wish to state that there was nothing there which one would not expect to find in the office of a newspaper entirely devoted to the cause of the working class. I do not deny that some of these books etc. belonged to me and I have claimed them back. Even the presence of such journals as the "Communist International," "Labour Monthly," "Inprecorr," R. I. L. U. Bulletins proves nothing. These journals come through His Majesty's post to the various newspapers' offices in the ordinary course.

The books which the Prosecution have selected from the searches in the "Kranti" office and put in as exhibits in this case can be roughly divided into two categories (1) Classical works of Marx, Engels and Lenin and general current Marxist Leninist literature, and (2) works dealing with the agrarian problems and the Cooperatives. I shall deal with the second category first.

I do not for the life of me see why these books are exhibited and what they are intended to prove. No doubt most of these books are in German and many of them have red covers and some of them actually have such obnoxious words as Moscow, U. S. S. R. etc. on the fly-leaf. The inference regarding the incriminating nature of these books appears to have been drawn by the Prosecution merely from these outer marks on the title page. The Prosecution have discreetly avoided bringing forward any evidence as to the contents of these books. In fact this would have proved rather an embarrassing task for them, as they had to rely on the intelligent assistance of a translator who mistook the German equivalent of "productive Cooperatives" for "productive comradeship."

P. 1177 for instance is a Scientific journal devoted to the study of Agrarian Economics, Agrarian politics, Agrarian legislation and Agrarian movements in general. It is the organ of the International Agrarian Institute, which seeks and obtains the collaboration of eminent bourgeois Economists like Professor Charles Gide and Professor Sering. This Institute has only one drawback. It has the misfortune to be situated in Moscow.

This volume contains scholarly articles on Cooperatives, wheat pools of Canada, on the Agrarian problem in Soviet Russia, in the Balkan States and so on, which will be considered valuable by every student of the Agrarian problem.

P 1191 and P 1192 are Monographs on Consumers' and Agricultural Cooperatives in Soviet Russia. The history and the growth of the Cooperative movement as well its structure, financial organisation etc: is described in these Monographs with the help of official statistics.

P 1192 entitled "Agricultural Cooperatives in Soviet Russia" is now available in English translation and is issued by the Horace Plunkett foundation. The English translation is on sale at Taraporewala's in Bombay (See catalogue D 725). A book, which a respectable bourgeois institute devoted to the study and the furtherance of Cooperative movement in Ireland finds it worth while to translate and publish, must not after all be so 'disreputable' as to be put in as an incriminating document in this case. Mr. Paul Scheffer, a bourgeois correspondent of a bourgeois German Daily, the "Berliner Tageblatt," characterised this book as a valuable monograph giving "clear statistical material." (See Leading Article by B. T. of 27. 10. 29.)

In filing these books as exhibits the Prosecution is not guided by any legal or juristic sense. It is merely their policemen's instinct, which makes them sniff and grab at books merely because they contain words like "Moscow," "U.S.S.R." "revolution" etc. The only purpose which the Prosecution wishes to serve by exhibiting these books is to deprive me of them for ever. Their attitude in this matter reminds me of that proverbial animal known as "the dog in the manger."

A number of classical works of Marx, Engels and Lenin were seized by the Police and many of them have been exhibited. I shall make passing reference to a few of them.

P 1166. It is a reprint of historical documents of the years 1847-48, which saw the birth of the Communist Manifesto. The main document in this book is the pamphlet by Fredric Engels entitled "The principles of Communism," which according to Professor Ryazanoff, "constituted the first draft of the Communist Manifesto." This pamphlet has recently been printed in English as an appendix to the big edition of the Communist Manifesto, issued by Professor Ryazanoff (Martin Lawrence, London 1930). Professor Ryazanoff remarks that, "in conjunction with the article on "The Revolutionary Movement of 1847," this question-and-answer pamphlet gives us an opportunity of determining the part

Engels played in the composition of the Manifesto.”

P 1182 (same as P 1487) is the German Edition of the Communist Manifesto of Marx and Engels, a document which rightly belongs to world literature. In its succinctly scientific though forcible exposition of the basic problem of modern society, the Manifesto has no equal in the Classical Socialist Literature. No single document has ever exerted such an extensive and intensive influence on a worldwide popular movement. The slogan “Workers of the world unite,” which this Manifesto first shouted to the world in 1848 has since become the battle-cry of the International working class movement. It is no wonder therefore that, today more than ever, when the brilliant prophecies of this Manifesto are in the process of realisation in Soviet Russia, that to-day this Manifesto should receive the widest publicity and circulation throughout the world. The Manifesto is a historical document, it has made history during the past 83 years of its life, it is making history even today. It belongs to the classics of Proletarian Literature. Suffice it to add that even men like Mr. Ramsay MacDonald and Professor Werner Sombart, who occupies the chair of political economy at the Berlin University, have in former days paid glowing tributes to this Manifesto. Today the same Mr. MacDonald is prosecuting us and holding up the same Manifesto against us as an incriminating document!

P 1178 contains criticisms of the various programmes of the Social Democratic Party of Germany from the pen of Marx and Engels. It contains the famous marginal notes of Marx on the Gotha Programme of the Social Democratic Party of Germany of 1875. As appendices are printed the recent programmes of the Social Democratic Party of Germany (the latest programme included being that of 1925).

P 1181 “Wage price and profit”—contains elementary lectures in Economics which were originally delivered by Marx in London in English. This is a German translation of the same.

P 1179. “Civil War in France” is a German translation of three manifestoes written by Marx for the First International. The first two manifestoes are on the France-Prussian War and the last and by far the most important one on the Paris Commune. (P 1871). Postgate, in his preface to the English Edition says, “‘The Civil War in France’ is still of value not only as a document of the time, not only as an exposition of Marxist theories but purely and simply as an historical record on facts. It would be actually possible today, 50 years after the Commune, to take this account written one day after the Commune’s fall and make it the basis for

a just and accurate historical appreciation."

P 1188. "Class Battles in France" describes the events between February 1849 and November 1850 in France. Auguste Bebel characterises this work as "a chapter of contemporary history from the point of view of the materialist conception of history." This book is, I believe, not yet available in English.

P 1183. 'Peasant Wars in Germany' by Fredric Engels, was first published as a series of articles in the "Neue Rheinische Zeitung" in 1850. In the words of Engels himself this is an attempt to "sketch the origin of Peasant Wars (1525 A.D.), the position of the various parties taking part in them, the political and religious theories which these parties made use of to justify their own position" (Page 155). Franz Mehring, the well-known literary historian of Germany and a Social Democrat, characterises this book as "a decisive progress in the knowledge of the history of the epoch of reformation." (Page 174).

P. 1193:— "The 18th Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte" by Karl Marx is a historical critical study of the coup d'état of Louis Bonaparte on 2nd December 1851 and the events and circumstances which led to it: Unlike the other two contemporary accounts of the same incident, this study is "an object lesson in Marxist interpretation of history." Marx himself says in his introduction to this book, "for my part, I prove that the class war in France created circumstances and relationships which enabled a grotesque mediocrity to strut about in a hero's garb."

The last four books, that is *P. 1179, 1183, 1188 and 1193*, are really speaking classical historical works. To a serious student of history they represent modern efforts in Marxist historiography. No doubt, these works do contain incidentally expositions of the Marxist theory of State, class struggle, as well as of the materialist conception of history. Even stray remarks on the strategy and tactics of the proletarian revolution, are found there in.

My defence of the possession of Marxist and Leninist literature is not based merely on the plea that these are classical works of history, economics and philosophy. I do wish to emphasise the revolutionary character of Marxism and Leninism, which forms the theoretical basis of the ideology programme of the C.I. Marxism is the concentrated revolutionary experience of the workers of all countries. Or, as Lenin put it, "it is the logical continuation and completion of the currents of thought which took their birth in the 19th century in the period of bourgeois revolutions in Europe." Arising out of the conditions and consciousness brought into being by capitalist society, Marxism is

destined to be a powerful instrument which will enable the exploited workers and peasants to remodel human society on newer and healthier lines.

It is urged against us, Communists, that we are trying to import and impose upon the Indian people a theory which is totally foreign and hence unsuited to their ^{peculiar}temperatures and tradition. We claim that the theory of Marxism is no more foreign to India than the theory of the steam engine and that of the mechanical loom. Our "National" bourgeoisie has accepted "foreign" Industrialism, "foreign" Capitalism; why do they grudge the Indian workers a "foreign" remedy against this newly-imported exploitation?

Marxism, the theory and ideology of the C. I., is not the monopoly of the Russians nor of the Germans. The ideas of Marxism and Communism belong to the culture of the world and cannot be allocated to one country and kept out of another. Marx, who first formulated these ideas was a German; but his analyses and conclusions were in the main based on the development of Capitalism as observed by him in England. Finally these ideas, which for decades past have been the guiding principles of the International Labour Movement on the Continent, are now for the first time finding their way towards 'concretisation' in Soviet Russia. Lenin has characterised Marxism as a theory "which cannot be fabricated, which grows out of the accumulated revolutionary experience and thought of all countries of the world."

Marxism as a social theory is strictly logical in its construction. Its postulates embrace all the three most important branches of human thought, namely philosophy, economics and politics. Marxism is not merely a school of politics or economics, not merely a system of philosophy; it is one composite outlook on life and the world. In short it is the "welt-anschauung" of the rising class, the beacon light of the era of Socialism.

On the continent of Europe, the Liberal sections of the bourgeoisie which is opposed to the conclusions of Marxism, recognises it as one of the achievements of human thought. In the thoroughly bourgeois University of Berlin you find a course of lectures on the materialist conception of history being included in the official list for the summer term of 1931 (March to July.) In India you imprison people for being Marxists, for propagating Marxian ideas. You seize classical works on Marxism which you find in their possession. You file well-recognised philosophical works on Materialism as incriminating evidence against them.

One is tempted to ask, is this a political trial or an inquisition for heresy of which one reads in the medieval history of Europe?

Marxism differs from all other schools of social thought in this that it is not based on any revelation or on any a-priori principles. The starting point of Marxism is the material conditions of human beings as organised in society, their way of earning their livelihood, that is their mode of production and distribution. Every given social order is characterised by its peculiar mode of production, is determined by the stage it has reached in the process of the evolution of its productive forces. It is this mode of production which determines the social, political and cultural life of that social order. Marx summarised this thought in the oft quoted "words, the mode of production of material life determines the general character of the social, political and intellectual processes of life. It is not the consciousness of human beings which determines their existence but conversely it is their social existence which determines their consciousness."

This is the basic conception of the Marxism and is known as the materialist conception of history.

From a vulgar point of view, a materialist is a gross, obstinate and a pig-headed person who for some unknown reason is out to destroy such eternal institutions as family, religion, morality and God etc. The Prosecution in this case share this view. It is true that in their Opening Address the Prosecution have dismissed the materialist philosophy of Marx with the remark that it was "an antiquated philosophy, for which nobody had any love". At the same time they have taken special delight in heaping cheap ridicule on our ideas about family, religion, God etc. Naturally we did not expect the members of the Prosecution to read or intelligently apply the contents of the books on Materialism which they have seized and exhibited in this case and we are not at all surprised at the fact that they have failed to perceive that our ideas about family, religion, etc. are mere deductions from the materialist conception of history.

Our conception of social institutions such as family, religion etc is scientific. We do not declare these institutions as permanent categories imposed upon men by the hand of God. We say that these institutions are conditioned by the economic structure of society, that is by the relations which men bear to one another in the social process of producing the means of livelihood. As society progresses, as productive forces develop, so do these institutions change in form as well as in content. The history of these institutions has borne this out. Even bourgeois sociology takes this view

with reference to primitive social institutions and their development in the past. Bourgeois sociology bases itself on the materialist principle but it never acknowledges its debt to Marx nor does it work out this principle to its logical conclusion. Bourgeois sociologists have not the courage of their convictions to apply the same principle to the phenomena of the dissolution of the family, religion, etc. which is taking place before their eyes under Capitalism. Their outlook is inconsistent and unscientific.

Marx for instance recognised the process of the break up of the old family system under Capitalism and the relation which this process bears to the capitalist mode of production. This process of break-up was to Marx the precursor of the higher form of the family. The thought has been pithily and forcefully expressed by him in "Capital" (P 455 page 529).

"However terrible, however repulsive, the break-up of the old family system within the organism of the capitalist society may seem, none the less large-scale industry, by assigning to women and to young persons and children of both sexes a decisive role in the socially organised process of production, and a role which has to be fulfilled outside the home, is building a new economic foundation for a higher form of the family and the relations between the sexes."

Capitalist morality is attempting to sanction and perpetuate the pre-capitalist form of family based on the slavery of women and children. The capitalist mode of production is already creating the conditions which tend to break up this old form. It is left to Socialism to destroy Capitalism, and to evolve a new form of the family based on equality, which will be made possible by the socialisation of production and distribution.

Our views about religion and God are similar. Religion and God are not permanent categories. These ideas have passed through various phases of transformation, from barbaric totemism to pantheistic mysticism, as demanded by the varying conditions of human society. These ideas have through centuries served but one purpose. They have in their various forms always been the ideological instruments in the hands of the ruling class to preserve and perpetuate their oppression and domination. Lenin has told us that "the idea of God never tied the individual to society but always kept the oppressed classes in bondage through the belief which it spread in the divinity of oppressors." The Prosecution, who attack us as anti-religion and anti-God, have perhaps not the breadth of vision to see that it is the representatives of their own class, the bourgeoisie, who struck the first blow at religion, God and

superstition. In the period of bourgeois revolutions, when the bourgeoisie was fighting against feudalism, it was forced to carry on an ideological struggle against "the divinity of oppressors," against God, against religion and superstition. The capitalist production and the consequent popularisation of the results of science and technique are rapidly undermining the very basis of religion and God, which is a credulity and ignorance. Today the bourgeoisie is no longer a progressive class, it is the representative of a decaying mode of production today it allies with the remnants of feudalism and seeks to neutralise class struggle with the help of open as well as subtle religious propaganda.

The reason why the Prosecution in this case has made so much capital out of the anti-religious character of Communists and Communism is not to be sought in the desire to protect freedom of conscience or freedom of worship in this country. As the representatives of the most backward and reactionary system in the world, they are afraid that an anti-religious propaganda would undermine the credulity and ignorance of the masses, which they wish to perpetuate in India as a fruitful soil for communal riots and pogroms, in order to exhaust the energy of the discounted masses in useless and bloody strifes and as a sure basis for communal rivalries and jealousies with which to cloud the issues of politics and class struggle. It is well-known that the most corrupt, despotic, and brutal regime known to history, namely the Czarist regime, employed methods to take advantage of the ignorance and credulity of sections of Christian and Jewish populations to institute from time to time bloody pogroms between them, in the pre-revolutionary Russia. Has any one heard of communal riots, of pogroms and of religious strife in the post revolutionary Russia, in Soviet which inspires so much pious abhorrence in the bourgeois hypocrites, because of the freedom it grants to open and anti-religious propaganda?

British Imperialist rule combines refined and polished methods of modern exploitation with the subtle and wily tricks of barbaric oppression. It has perfected the whole technique of instigating and staging bloody orgies and mass communal slaughters with the help of paid agents and hired assassins recruited from the lowest strata of the lumpen proletariat, who work in the closest cooperation with the British Indian Police system, the corruption, the cruelty and the cunningness of which has no parallel anywhere in the world. This technique which it has perfected during thirty years or more of communal riots in India has been successfully employed by British Imperialism in Palestine to institute Arab-Jew riots in 1929. Japanese Imperialism has also "copied" it and

is practising it today in its colony Korea for staging Chinese—
Korean riots which recently resulted in terrific slaughter.
Imperialist colonial regime cannot afford to lose the prop it has
in the religious and superstitious crudity and ignorance of the
masses it exploits.

D/ 26.9.1931

What I want to stress is this that these black coated pious gentlemen who with a serious and sanctimonious air charge us with being anti-religious, of holding anti-religious views and expressing them, are the representatives of a despicably backward system, which deliberately promotes religious obscurantism, perpetuates religious superstition and prejudices, employs hired badmashes and goondas to take advantage of the same by provocative acts to institute veritable blood baths from time to time.

Our point of view in the matter of religion is as follow:—

As Marxists and materialists we are positively anti-religion and anti-God. But we know full well that religion cannot be abolished by merely carrying on an abstract and purely theoretical propaganda against it. Lenin emphasised that the fight against religion has to be carried out concretely on the basis of class struggle. The roots of religious confusion can be finally abolished only when the class struggle develops to such a pitch that the oppressed classes sweep away all remnants of feudalism, overthrow the rule of the bourgeoisie, and advance towards the task of reorganising society on a socialist basis. This does not mean however that we give up every fight against religion till the advent of the revolution. Our attitude towards anti-religious propaganda is clearly defined in the decisions of the 5th Congress of the C. I. in the following words:—

“Among the tasks of combatting bourgeois prejudices and superstitions, the first place is taken by the fight against religion, a fight which must be carried on with all requisite tact and all caution especially among those sections of workers in whose daily life religion has hitherto been deeply rooted.” (P 2398).

Our ideas about religion, morality, God etc. are not so many dogmas, but are based on a materialist interpretation of the evolution of social forces and social ideas.

In fact the introduction of the materialist conception into the social sciences was one of the greatest contributions to human knowledge which we owe to Marx. It raised the study of social phenomena to the level of a science. It achieved for the social sciences what Darwin's conception did for Biology and the principle

of the conservation of matter did for Chemistry. The entry of the materialist outlook in the natural sciences was hailed by the bourgeoisie of the 18th and 19th centuries as a great advance. Fredrick Engels in his introduction to the English Edition of "Socialism from Utopia to a Science" says, "The bourgeoisie required for the development of its industrial production a science which investigated the properties of natural substances and the laws of action of natural forces. Up to that time the sciences was but the handmaid of the church, which dared not outstep the limits set to it by faith."

But the consistent application of the materialist outlook to the social sciences, which was for the first time achieved by Marx and Engels, did not find favour with the bourgeoisie. No doubt, Materialist thought was invading the domain of social problems, but, as Lenin has pointed out, "the pre-Marxist sociology and historiography, in the best event, gave an accumulation of dry facts collected in fragments and supplied a description of isolated aspects of the historical process". Marx on the other hand "pointed out the way to a comprehensive and an all-embracing study of the process of the genesis, the development and the decay of social and economic structures", which was so distasteful to the bourgeoisie. They liked to believe that their economic laws, such as the laws of supply and demand, the laws of diminishing returns etc: were eternal laws of nature. They liked to believe that their social order the capitalist order, was the final culmination of the process of social evolution. To Marx however the capitalist social order was but a phase in the development of human society. The so-called eternal laws of Economics were for him merely the laws of the capitalist social order, which held good so long as that social order based on private property and market relations existed. The capitalist social order itself was neither stable nor stagnant but perpetually in a state of development.

In the oft-quoted words of Marx, "at a certain stage of development the materialist productive forces of society come into conflict with the existing productive relationships, or, to express the matter in legal terminology, with the property relationships within which they have moved. These relationships which have previously been developmental forms of productive forces, now become metamorphosed into fetters upon production; a period of social revolution begins. Concomitant with the change in the economic foundation the whole gigantic superstructure is more or less rapidly transformed". (from the preface to the "Critique of Political Economy".)

This paragraph contains the quintessence of the materialist conception of the growth, development and the decay of social

structures. Applied to Capitalism, it means that the basic relations underlying capitalism, such as private ownership of the means of production, wage slavery, production for the market etc: become during the course of development a fetter on production, a hindrance to the healthy progress of humanity as a whole. A new social force growing up within the capitalist society itself comes up against these barriers and ultimately demolishes them, thus opening up the way for further progress. The capitalist social relations are replaced by socialist ones, the economic structure of capitalism is rapidly transformed into a socialist one. This change of the economic structure is accompanied by a corresponding change in the 'superstructure', that is in the political, cultural and the social institutions and traditions which characterised the previous social order.

Marx however was not content with a mere philosophical generalisation about the inevitable collapse of Capitalism and the advent of Socialism. He supported his general formulation by a detailed economic analysis of the capitalist social order which is incorporated in his monumental work "Capital". Basing himself on the theory of surplus value, which reveals the secret of capitalist profit, Marx showed how the progressive accumulation of Capital takes place (P 455, Part VII); how Capital becomes centralised and concentrated into fewer and bigger aggregations (ibidem page 619 and onward); how as the capitalist class becomes wealthier and smaller the working class becomes bigger (page 675-77), but at the same time a permanent class of unemployed workers or what is known as the 'industrial reserve army' is formed (page 694), which is larger, the larger becomes the employed population (page 712). The employed workers are subjected to increasing specialisation and division of Labour, women and children introduced into industry; at first the working day tends to be prolonged, subsequently is shortened by legislation but the intensity of Labour progressively and greatly increases. As a result of these and many other tendencies notably the periodical crisis arising from over-production and under-payment of the workers, the poverty and the misery of the working class as a whole increases progressively.

The economic analysis which Marx gave of the classical phase of Capitalism holds good today in its broad outline. The superiority of Marxian economics over bourgeois economics lies in this that the former gives a consistent and a sound explanation of some of the puzzling features of capitalism such as the cycle of trade depression, the crisis, unemployment, the fall in the rate of profit etc. In fact Marx pointed out that these characteristics

were indissolubly connected with the basic social relations of capitalism such as private ownership of the means of production, wage slavery, production for market, competition etc; and that the only cure for them was the overthrow of Capitalism itself.

Marx's economic and philosophic interpretation of the existing social order is in itself "critical and revolutionary". It is critical of the bourgeois interpretation of the capitalist social order in that it has exposed the frauds of bourgeois economics; it is revolutionary because it has laid bare the laws of motion of the capitalist society and has brought to our notice the forces which will lead to the breakup of that society. Both of these aspects of Marxism are positively abominable to the bourgeoisie, a class whose very existence is based on the permanence of Capitalism. Marx himself knew full well that his interpretation and analysis was "a scandal and an abomination to the bourgeoisie and its doctrinaires and spokesmen, because while supplying a positive understanding of the existing state of things it at the same time furnishes an understanding of the negation of that state of things and enables us to recognise that that state of things will inevitably break up."

Marxism is however not a mere economic or philosophic interpretation of the world. It is at the same time a guide to its revolutionary change. Marx in his well-known epigrammatic thesis on Feuerbach has said, "The philosophers have interpreted the world differently, the point is to change it."

If the economic and philosophical theories of Marxism enable us to understand the inevitability of the collapse of capitalism, the revolutionary politics of Marxism teach the working class how to equip itself for its historic mission, namely the violent overthrow of the capitalist order. It is this last-named aspect of Marxism which has been characterised as "the greatest weapon of the Proletarian struggle which becomes a powerful force as soon as it captures the masses." (P. 2358, page 10). As I have already shown the Prosecution has skipped over the economic and the philosophical aspect of Marxism and concentrated their attack or rather their abuse on the basic principles underlying its revolutionary politics, namely "class struggle," "the theory of State" etc. The prosecution have caricatured these principles before this Court. In their petition of complaint they charge us with "inciting antagonism between Capital and Labour," in their Opening Address, the Prosecution heaped much ridicule upon Marx for his arbitrary division of the world into two classes. If the Prosecution had possessed patience and intelligence to read and understand the literature they have filed as exhibits in this

case, they would have resorted to a more artful and intelligent method of attack than mere cheap ridicule.

The fundamental antagonism between Capital and Labour, between the Proletariat and the bourgeoisie, is the very basis of the capitalist society and is determined by the relations these classes bear to one another in that mode of production. It is not of our making, it exists independent of us. Marx certainly made this fundamental class - cleavage in the modern society the starting point of his revolutionary politics. But to say that Marxist politics is based upon a mechanical and an arbitrary division of the world into two classes is absurd. The class differentiation of the capitalist society was to Marx a process which followed in the wake of the spread of the Capitalist mode of production. In the Communist Manifesto, he speaks of "the society as a whole splitting up more and more into two great hostile camps." In fact Marx carefully studied and recorded the process of proletarianisation of the peasantry and the growth of the Proletariat and deduced from this study the fact that it was the Proletariat which was preeminently fitted to lead a political struggle of the exploited classes. In the Communist Manifesto itself Marx and Engels trace the rise of the Proletariat which accompanied the rise of the bourgeois society. He points out how the earlier spontaneous conflicts between the bourgeoisie and the Proletarians gave rise to the Trade Unions, and finally how in spite of difficulties the organisation of the Proletarians into a class and consequently into a political party proceeds gradually but firmly onward. It is absurd to attribute to Marx a rigid and mechanical sub-division of the modern society into two classes. The essence of the class analysis of the modern society as given by Marx is as follows:—

"The most important classes which face each other as exploiter and exploited classes in the capitalist society are the bourgeoisie and the Proletariat. The former is a class which has outlived its utility and is today no more progressive but actually a reactionary force, while the latter is the champion and the natural ally of all the exploited classes. In the words of the Manifesto, "of all the classes that stand face to face with the bourgeoisie today the Proletariat alone is a really revolutionary class. The other classes decay and finally disappear in the phase of modern industry. The Proletariat is its special and essential product."

Politics is nothing if it is not class struggle and to ignore class struggle in politics is to ignore politics altogether. All modern politics ultimately resolves itself into a struggle between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. Now this struggle of the proletariat

and the other oppressed classes in so far as it is a political struggle is a struggle directed against the bourgeois State. This brings us to the second basic principle of the political theory of Marx, namely the theory of State. The Prosecution in their characteristic manner have given a caricature of this theory to the Court. They call it fantastic. According to them every ordinary man regards the State "as an institution which, for better or for worse, is there to guard the liberties and rights of all the citizens in the State and see that they all get fair play and equal treatment." I can quite appreciate that the Prosecution as the representatives of the Imperialist State wish to see that every ordinary man thinks so. The spokesmen of the bourgeoisie do their best to propagate this myth of a super-class benevolent State among the masses. But the daily experience of the man in the street, the worker and the peasant gives the direct lie to this myth. In advanced capitalist countries with so-called democratic traditions the State with its military and police is always on the side of the capitalists in every labour conflict. "Democratic" and Republican America is a model example of the brutality and ruthlessness with which the State machinery crushes every genuine working class movement. Things are not much different in other democratic countries of Europe. In spite of democracy, in spite of universal suffrage, the State in these countries is nothing but an organ of oppression and exploitation in the hands of the capitalist class. Based on bureaucracy, the military and the police and hedged round with class legislation the State in these countries is an armed fortress which defends the capitalist privileges and keeps by force the capitalist relations intact in society.

Marx has described the State under Capitalism as follows: "At the same pace at which the progress of modern industry developed, widened and intensified the class antagonism between Capital and Labour, the State power assumed more and more the character of the national power of Capital over Labour, of a public force organised for social enslavement, of an engine of class despotism". (P 1179 pages 51-52).

Later on Engels made a historical critical study of the State as a social institution, giving a brilliant materialist exposition of the origin and the development of the State through the various epochs of human evolution. "The State", he pointed out, "did not exist from time immemorial but it came into existence as soon as human society was split into classes. The State has always been identified with the most powerful and economically dominant class in society. The State is the organ of political domination in the hands of such a class, which enables it to subjugate and exploit the other classes in society".

Engels entertained no illusions about "the democratic republic" although he characterised it as the "highest form of State possible in modern capitalist society." He realised that the bourgeois-democratic State officially did not make a distinction on the basis of property, but in practice it was eminently suited to preserve and perpetuate capitalist domination. "Adult suffrage" he pointed out, "may be considered as the thermometer of the political maturity of the proletariat. It can and will never mean any thing more in the modern State. But perhaps it is sufficient, for on the day the thermometer reaches the boiling point the capitalists will know where they stand". ("The origin of family etc").

What I wish to stress is this that the bourgeois State with its vaunted democracy never ceases in practice to be a class State and an engine of class despotism. Marx and Engels were not deceived by the so-called democratic traditions of the bourgeois State. They knew full well that "the working class can not simply lay hold of the ready-made State machinery and wield it for its own purpose."

I must pause here a moment to consider an important political conclusion which necessarily follows from the theory of State as propounded by Marx. The transition of Capitalism to Socialism takes place, according to Marx, only through a revolutionary overthrow, of the capitalist State and the establishment of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat, which acts as a lever in the hands of the working class for the achievement of Socialism and for the final abolition of the classes. He formulated the thought very early in his book "Class struggles in France". "Revolutionary Socialism," he says there, is the declaration of a permanent revolution, the establishment of the class Dictatorship of the Proletariat as a necessary step towards the abolition of class distinction in general, towards the abolition of all the conditions of production on which class distinction depends, towards the abolition of all social relations which depend on these conditions of production, towards the revolutionisation of all ideas which emanate from these social relations." (P 1188 page 94)

Later in life, that is in 1875, he formulated the same thought more precisely in his "Commentary to the Gotha Programme". What I wish to stress is this that Marxism does not merely consist in the materialist conception of history and the economic analysis of Capitalism, as the socialists of the Second International make out. If you accept these two you have to accept class struggle, the theory of State and consequently the Dictatorship of the Proletariat as well. Mr. Brailsford tries to make out in his

deposition that Marx towards the end of his life came round to the view that the revolution would be unnecessary in countries with long democratic traditions and manhood suffrage. What however Marx said in a public meeting at Hague in 1872 after the Hague Congress of the First International was as follows:—"In most continental countries force will have to be the lever of the revolution. It is to force that in due time the worker will have to appeal, if the domination of Labour is at last to be established..... we do not deny that there are certain countries such as the U.S.A., and England in which the workers may hope to secure their ends by peaceful means." Such and other similar quotations from Marx do not warrant the conclusion that Marx was propounding the theory of "constitutional Socialism." Marx was merely pointing out a possible exception to "the general historical law of revolution" which he had already propounded. The reason which led Marx to make room for this possible reservation in the case of England and America at that time has been explained by Lenin. Marx and Engels had made clear that the revolutionary Dictatorship of the Proletariat was necessitated by the fact that there existed well-organised standing army and bureaucracy at the back of the bourgeois State. Lenin points out that in the seventies of the last century just these institutions did not exist in England and America. (P 898 page 21).

This question has been thoroughly discussed by Lenin in his "State and Revolution" and "Proletarian Revolution." I am here merely concerned with the conclusion that the acceptance of the philosophical, economic and political principles of Marx necessarily includes the acceptance of a violent revolution and of the establishment of the dictatorship of the toiling masses as a lever for future social progress.

Thus Marx and Engels not only formulated the fundamental revolutionary tasks of the working class, but they also laid down the main principles in the strategy of the Proletarian Revolution. I shall merely enumerate them as they form the theoretical ground work of the Communist strategy of today.

(1) Since the days of the formation of the Communist League in 1848-1849 Marx and Engels have struggled for the formation of the political party of the working class, "which was not only distinguished from the other political parties of the possessing class but was directly hostile towards them." "The Communist Manifesto" and "The Principles of Communism" were the draft programmes of such a party. Later on Marx and Engels took prominent part in the foundation of the First International. The principles of revolutionary struggle which

guide the Communist Parties today were evolved in the main during the brief life time of this International. That the Party is the conscious vanguard of the working class, that the Party was to be organised on the principle of democratic centralism, and that the Party was to participate in class struggle in every form and phase and support every revolutionary movement, these principles were the guiding principles of the First International and have been stressed by Marx and Engels in their writings. The Party was to effect the synthesis of the economic and political struggle of the working class and to lead it to the capture of power. This is clearly laid down in a resolution adopted at the Hague Congress of the First International in 1872.

“The constitution of the working class into a political party is absolutely essential to secure the triumph of the social revolution as well as the abolition of all classes. The organisation of forces which the working class has effected in its economic struggle must at the same time serve as a lever in its fight against the political power of the landlords and capitalists. And as the masters of landed property and capital shall always be using their political privileges to defend their economic monopolies and to perpetuate them, it would be the great task of the proletariat to capture political power.” (P 1195, page 280).

(2) Marx formulated the general principle of revolutionary Trade Unionism in a resolution which he proposed at the end of the series of lectures on “value, price and profit” in London in 1865. Criticising the British Trade Unions he says that “the Trade Unions fail generally from limiting themselves to a guerilla warfare against the effects of the existing system instead of simultaneously trying to change it, instead of using their organised forces as a lever for the final emancipation of the working class, that is to say the ultimate abolition of the wage system.” (P 1776).

(3) Marx and Engels enunciated the fundamental principles underlying the strategy of the proletariat with reference to peasantry in the coming revolution. The Prosecution stated in their Opening Address that “you can search the writings of Marx through and find practically no, if any, very little reference to the peasants.” We are not at all surprised at the statement. Very probably the Police did not mark out the passages in the copies by Marx which they handed over to the Prosecution. That however does not alter the fact that Marx analysed the economic process of the penetration of capital on land leading to the pauperisation and proletarianisation of the peasants. (“Capital” Volume III Part 2). In P 1188 (“Class struggles in France, pages 88, 89 and 92), he describes a concrete example of this process,

namely France after the Revolution. He described how after the abolition of landlordism land became a commodity in France leading to the progressive fractionisation of land, how the peasant came under the grip of the usurer and the republican tax-gatherer, and how this led to the progressive fall of income of the French peasant. He comes to the conclusion that "the exploitation of the peasant differs from that of the industrial proletariat only in form. The exploiter is the same, namely the capitalist." The practical political conclusion he draws from this is "the rallying of the peasantry round the proletariat as the decisive revolutionary force, for a revolt against bourgeois dictatorship, for a change in society." Marx had thus clearly formulated the fundamental idea of the revolutionary alliance of the proletariat and peasantry as a necessary pre-condition for the success of the proletarian revolution in an agrarian country. About Germany he said, in 1856, "everything in Germany will depend upon whether it will be possible to support the proletarian revolution by something like a second edition of the peasant wars". (D 407, page 7). Engels later on studied the question of the participation of the peasantry more closely and studied its class structure and pointed out which sections of the same will readily follow the lead of the proletariat and what stage of the revolution. (D 407, pages 18, 19 and 20).

I have briefly touched upon the philosophical, economic and political aspects of Marxism and attempted to point out the salient features of its revolutionary teachings. This was essential and important in as much as Marxism forms the theoretical ground work of the ideology, strategy and tactics of the Communist International. Out of the early struggles of the proletariat against Capital which took place in the second half of the 19th century arose the First International, the conscious vanguard of the working class. Marxism, the powerful weapon of the proletariat was forged in the fire of these early struggles. The Communist International has taken over the weapon, sharpened and strengthened and made it suitable for the present epoch.

Lenin Day Meeting.

Just at this point I shall like to take up the Lenin Day Meeting of 21st January 1929. I was present at this meeting and spoke, although, as it would appear from P 1690, my speech was neither appreciated nor understood by the intelligent police reporter Mr. Mankar. The Prosecution in this case, I believe, relies upon the report which appeared in the "Spark" of 27th January 1929. The importance of the Lenin Day and why the Communists demonstrate on Lenin Day has already been explained in many previous statements. I am merely concerned here with explaining and justifying

quite briefly what I have been alleged to have said in this meeting.

But before I proceed to do this I would like to refer to a gross misrepresentation and distortion of the role of Lenin which occurs in the statement of Dr. Vishva Nath Mukerji before this Court. Dr. Mukerji says that Lenin was not a follower of Marx but of Bakunin, that Lenin was not a Marxist but "a Russian terrorist of the Bakunin type." I am sure Dr. Mukerji has excellent reasons for placing this historical falsehood before the Court. Dr. Mukerji wishes to pose himself as a true follower of the Labour and Socialist International and as such is interested in placing all that Lenin, Leninism and Communism stand for, namely the Dictatorship of the Proletariat, the revolutionary overthrow of Capitalism and Imperialism etc, outside the pale of the "genuine socialist movement". As he wishes to swear by "Marxism" of the Second International brand he is naturally interested, to speak in legal language, in breaking the link between his type of Marxism and revolutionary Socialism. His intentions are certainly excellent, but unfortunately history is too well and too widely known to be so easily misrepresented.

The origin of this misrepresentation however lies not with Dr. Mukerji but with Mr. Rene Fullop Muller, a bourgeois writer whose book "Lenin and Gandhi" is a Defence exhibit in this case. Mr. Rene Fullop Muller, who makes the statement that Lenin was a true Russian terrorist of the Bakunin type, attempts to bolster up this colossal lie by misinterpreting a quotation from Zinovieff which, if it is genuine, is surely torn out of its context. The quotation from Zinovieff is as follows, "Comrade Lenin by temperament belonged entirely to the first generation of terrorist revolutionaries, to that glorious host of warriors whose names will shine as glittering stars." Now what Zinovieff probably meant to say is simply this that Lenin, as so many other Russian Marxists, had connections with terrorists of "Narodnaya Wolya" Party before they entered the working class movement as Marxists, and that he shared the revolutionary zeal and the self-sacrificing spirit which characterised these early terrorists. It is well known that Lenin's own brother belonged to the terrorist party and was executed in connection with a terrorist act. It is equally well known to those who have cared to study the works of Lenin, that his early writings, those about 1897-1902, are in the main polemics against the terrorists of the Narodniki, showing them the futility of their ways and appealing to them to accept Marxism as the policy of the working class. Besides it is not clear what the author exactly means when he says that Lenin was a terrorist of the Bakunin type. Does he mean that Lenin favoured the method of individual terrorism or does he mean that he accepted the anarchist theory of Bakunin?

Anyone with the slightest knowledge of the writings of Lenin would not dare to make any of these statements. Lenin has severely castigated the supporters of the method of individual terrorism as well as the theory of anarchism. Comrade Hutchinson has quoted passages from Lenin in which he (Lenin) shows the difference between anarchism and revolutionary Socialism and explains why he rejects the former.

When I say that Rene Fullop Muller is a bourgeois author and as such is interested in misrepresenting Lenin, I do not mean that all bourgeois authors have been equally dishonest in depicting Lenin. In an excellent little study of Lenin, which has recently appeared in series called "The Makers of the modern age", the author Professor D. S. Mirsky, who describes himself as a member of the Russian aristocracy, takes the correct view of Lenin in this respect. Professor Mirsky correctly points out that "Lenin did nothing but awaken the revolutionary soul of Marxism that had been lulled to sleep by the Second International, and his teaching is nothing more than Marxism as opposed to pseudo-Marxism." ("Lenin" by Mirsky, Holme Press 1931). The renegades of Socialism and of the Second International find it convenient to forget that the Communist doctrines which Lenin taught are in essence contained in the writings of Marx and Engels.

Mr. Reni Fullop Muller's estimation of Lenin is based on the complete ignorance of Marxism and the writings of Lenin. The difference between Leninism and the method of individual terrorism and the theory of anarchism will be clear to anyone who has even the most superficial knowledge of the life and work of Lenin. Even the Magistrate has made no mistake in this matter.

Lenin then was the greatest Marxist of our time, who bitterly fought against "revisionism," against all attempts to corrupt Marxism by Labour Imperialists, and carried forward the work of Marx in the epoch of Imperialism, at the same time working out a practical application of his theory. This is, I think, the statement which is alleged to be the substance of my speech at the Lenin Day meeting. Generally speaking I think it is quite correct. I have already pointed out that the conception of capitalism as a decaying system, the revolution as the only possible way of transition from capitalism to Socialism, the Dictatorship of the Proletariat as the only possible state-form during the transition period, the necessity of smashing the bourgeois State and creating a proletarian State of the type of the Paris Commune, the role of the Proletarian Party as the organised, disciplined vanguard of the working class, the importance of the

fighting alliance between the Proletariat and the peasantry, - all these fundamentally Communist doctrines which Lenin taught are explicitly contained in the writings of Marx and Engels.

Without Marxism there is no Leninism. Lenin however enriched the general doctrines of Marxism by the solution of certain specific problems characteristic of the present epoch. To put it in the picturesque language of Professor Mirsky "Leninism is distinct from Marxism in the measure in which it introduces into the "Algebra of revolution," the numerical values of the age of Imperialism, of the Proletarian revolution." In other words Leninism is Marxism of the epoch of Imperialism, of the period of the decline of Capitalism.

I have attempted to indicate the content of the philosophical, economic and political implications of the teachings of Marx. The life work of Lenin consists in deepening and broadening these teachings of Marx and Engels in the light of the experience of the epoch of Imperialism and of the struggles of the Proletariat which have taken place in that epoch. Above all the life work of Lenin is the most brilliant proof of the soundness of the Marxian theory, the correctness of Marxist prediction. Lenin has shown to the workers and peasants of the world how to wield the weapon of Marxist theory and showed them the way towards the realisation of the ideals of Marx.

Lenin's fight against "revisionism" is intimately bound up with the advance of Marxism towards a correct interpretation of the present epoch of Imperialism; in clearing off the revisionist rubbish of the "democratisation of Capital," of the "peaceful and organic growth of capitalism into socialism," Lenin removed the shackles which were preventing Marxism from giving a correct economic interpretation of the present phase of capitalism, from being the powerful weapon in the hands of the working class, which it was in the days of Marx and Engels, for their final emancipation.

Lenin pointed out that the process of concentration and accumulation of capital and production, far from overcoming the fundamental contradictions of capitalism shown by Marx, gives birth to another set of conflicts which brings the collapse of capitalism nearer than ever. The concentration and accumulation of Capital in advanced capitalist countries leads to the falling rate of profit in these countries, Capital begins to wander in the shape of "Finance-Capital" to less advanced and backward countries, for the conquest and the monopolist hold of the sources of raw material, for the capture of markets, for the purpose of transferring certain

sections of export industry from the metropolitan centre to places of cheap labour. This epoch of the world-wide operation of Finance-Capital is called Imperialism. This epoch, Lenin characterises as the last phase of capitalism, because in this epoch, in spite of the formation of world-wide-combines and trusts, competition instead of being eliminated grows ever more intense and takes the form of International rivalries which ultimately must culminate in Imperialist wars leading to the final collapse of world Imperialism. The fundamental conflicts of Imperialism which Lenin discovered and enumerated are as follows:—

(1) As long as there was elbow room in the world for contending capitalisms of the advanced countries of Europe to expand things seemed to go smoothly, Imperialist booty flowed into these countries. A thin strata of the "aristocracy of Labour" could be bribed, leading to the growth of revisionist illusions in the ranks of Labour. But no sooner was the world all divided up between these capitalist bandits, no sooner was there nothing more for them to conquer, than the competition and rivalry between them assumed a fiercer form, the rate of profit began to fall, capitalists in the principal advanced countries, in their attempt to keep up their profit, opened a fierce attack on the wages and the conditions of the workers. This general offensive of Capital against the working class is the first feature of the present epoch.

(2) Rivalries between the gigantic world combines took the form of rivalries between the principal capitalist nations for the control of the sources of raw material, for the domination of the world market; this scramble for a redistribution of colonial possession, for "a place in the sun", created the pre-conditions for the great Imperialist war. In view of the intensity and the world-wide character of these rivalries it is clear that they must unnecessarily result in world wars involving a monstrous destruction of the working class as well as of the means of production, thus almost threatening the entire structure of capitalist society with extinction.

(3) The third conflict which grows up within the Imperialist structure, is the awakening of the consciousness among the colonial peoples of the world, who begin to revolt against the barbarous conditions of exploitation and oppression imposed upon them for decades by Imperialism.

These are in the main the results of a Marxist analysis of the present epoch of Imperialism. Lenin's life work is a unique illustration of the close direct and living connection between the theory and practice of Marxism. Lenin not only succeeded in unravelling the economy of the epoch of Imperialism and placing it in its proper

perspective as the last phase of capitalism leading to the epoch of wars and revolutions, but also in solving many specific problems of the tactic and strategy arising out of the practical struggle of the toiling masses of the world for socialism. In fact the life work of Lenin is a classical example of the correlation of the theory and practice of the struggle for socialism.

I shall here merely enumerate the most important problems of struggle which he formulated and helped to solve.

(1) The tactic of the Proletariat in the epoch of Imperialist war, the necessity of converting Imperialist war into a civil war, into a revolution against the bourgeoisie.

(2) The conditions and the forms of realising the Dictatorship of the Proletariat.

(3) The role of the Proletarian State in the transition period.

(4) The form of the concrete type of the Proletarian State in that period, namely the Soviet State.

(5) Lenin further taught us the role of the Party; how the Party of the Proletariat is to be built up out of the most class-conscious elements of the working class, participating in the day to day class struggle, impressing upon the workers the inevitability of the collapse of capitalism and rallying them round the banner of revolution.

(6) Lenin especially stressed the relations between the Proletariat and the peasantry and pointed out the necessity of the revolutionary alliance between these two sections of the toilers. Lenin explained the process of class differentiation inside the peasantry which goes on with the development of capitalism, showing which sections of the peasantry will support the Proletariat in its revolutionary struggle and formulating the tactics which the Proletarian Party should adopt with reference to the various sections of the peasantry in the different stages of the revolution.

(7) Lenin finally showed the significance of the national movements in the colonies and semi-colonies for the World Proletarian Revolution, and formulated the broad principles underlying the strategy of the Communist Parties in these countries.

(8) Lenin unfolded the grandiose perspective of the World Revolution, leading to the formation of a world union of Socialist and Soviet Republics, pointing out at the same time the possibility for the backward countries of directly launching on the path towards socialist development with the help of the more advanced Soviet

Republics, and thus avoiding altogether the intermediate stage of capitalist development with all its brutalities.

The problems here enumerated had already been formulated more or less clearly by Marx and Engels. Lenin during the 30 years of his revolutionary career solved them in the light of the class struggle which he lived through and in which he actively participated. Lenin's legacy to the toiling millions of the world is 'the sum total of this revolutionary experience', which we call Leninism. It is not left to us merely in the form of the 30 volumes of his collected works. The living embodiment of Leninism is the general staff of the World Revolution, the Communist International, which, as has been said here, is the greatest monument to the memory of Lenin.

It is necessary to stress one point before I leave the subject and that is that we do not take Marxism or Leninism as a dogma. We do not say that Lenin has shown us the way towards the World Revolution and World Communism in its every detail. Lenin has taught us how to apply Marxism, how to learn from the experience of the masses, how best to find the path towards Communism and classless society. Lenin himself has said, "Our teaching is not dogma but a guide to action. We do not pretend that Marx or Marxists know the way to Socialism in all its correct developments. That is nonsense. We know the direction of the road, we know which class forces lead to Socialism, but concretely this will only be shown in the experience of the millions when they take action". This is all that I have to say about my presence at the Lenin Day meeting. I have nothing more to say about P 1690.

As far as P 1261 I cannot be expected to know anything about it.

"The articles in the 'Spark.'"

P 1163 :- I have very little to say about the articles which appeared under my name in the 'Spark'. Sometime in January 1929 I happened to notice an advertisement in the Indian Daily Herald as well as in the Bombay Chronicle announcing a new Socialist Weekly called the 'Spark'. To me it was a healthy sign of the growing interest of Indian intellectuals in socialism and in the socialist movement. It was quite natural therefore that I should attempt to seek publicity for articles on questions relating to socialism and to the workers' movement in general. At that time there was no English paper of that type in Bombay or in fact anywhere else in India. The three articles which appear under my name there had been sent by me to the editor. The articles speak for

themselves and there is very little to be said about them. The first article "What Germany thinks of India" gives by impressions of the attitude of the various class in Germany to the Indian problem. The second deals with the Trade Disputes Bill from the workers' point of view. The last "Youth Leagues reformist or revolutionary" is a reply to the article of Mr. Mehraally which had appeared in the previous issue. My idea in sending in this article was to provoke controversy on the issue of Youth Leagues and their relation to the national emancipatory struggle. The article contained an appeal to the youths to turn their attention to the theory of Marxism. The article was attempt to provoke further discussions both from the nationalist as well as socialist side.

Apart from this I had no connection whatsoever with the 'Spark'. The 'Spark' had nothing whatsoever to do with our Party. It had no connection whatsoever with the Workers' and Peasants' Party as well.

Association with the "Kranti"

"Kranti" was the organ of the Workers' and Peasants' Party. I was a member of this Party, so there is nothing surprising whatsoever with my association with that paper. I have nothing further to say about it.

P 1344:—As regards P 1344 I have already said that I know nothing about this document and consequently cannot say anything about the statements made on pages 87 and 148 therein.

P 1164 are cuttings of a series of elementary articles in the "Kranti" in the form of questions and answers on Communism. There is nothing surprising to find the "Kranti" cuttings in the "Kranti" office.

Summary.

I have gone through all the exhibits cited by the Court against me at the beginning of the examination. I shall put together my replies to them in the following:—

P1484, 1485, 1479, 1477, 1488, 1478:— The explanation of these exhibits is given in the section entitled "Customs Office Search." I have nothing more to add.

P 1683C, 1811, 1657, 870:—I have dealt with these exhibits in the section "Connection with Co-conspirators in Germany." Apart from what I have said there I know nothing more about these exhibits.

P 1165:—Probably is a copy of an article received in the Kranti office through post in the ordinary course. I have no knowledge about its source^{or} origin.

P 1674 and 1676:—Dealt with in the section "Alleged secret correspondence with the Co-conspirators abroad."

P 1825 and 1512:— I know nothing about them.

P 1295, 1170, 1171, 1172, 1173, 1168 and 1297:—Dealt with at the end of section on the "Membership of the C. P. I."

P 1373, 1353,¹³⁴³ 1344 and 1345:—Dealt with in the section on the "Membership of the Workers' and Peasants' Party."

P 1690 and 1261:—Dealt with in the section on Lenin-Day Meeting.

P 949:—I know nothing about it.

P 311:—I know nothing about it.

P 1196 and 1194:—I have nothing to say about these.

P 1174:—I know nothing about this.

P 1163:—Nothing to add. Already dealt with in the 'spark'.

P 1164:—Also dealt with under the head 'Association with the "Kranti".'

P 1195:—One of the strangest exhibits in this case. It is a Calendar for the year 1929. But it has the misfortune of being a Communist Calendar. In this Calendar you find at the bottom of each of the 365 pages the most offensive words "Ten years of The Communist International". The explanation of this is as follows:—

An enterprising publishing house in Germany which specialises in working-class literature found it worth while to print a Calendar to commemorate the 10th Anniversary of the Communist International which fell in 1929. The production, as Your Honour can satisfy yourself by looking at it, is excellent. Every datepage contains a picture or a cartoon which will gladden the heart of a revolutionary worker. It also contains memorable revolutionary dates for his instruction. At the back of each page you will find excellent quotations from Marx, Engels, Lenin as well as extracts from general revolutionary working class literature. The Calendar was with me when I landed. It escaped the notice of Mr. Chaudhri, and it was left to his brother officer Mr. Sherazi to carry off the prize and deliver it into the hands of the Prosecution, who I believe have discovered in it a very valuable piece of incriminating evidence.

Regarding credentials: While I was giving my explanation regarding credentials which I brought with me Mr. Khairat Nabi was heard to whisper that he had not seen them. I am giving him and the Prosecution an opportunity of having a look at the document by handing it over to the Court for inspection. (A German document shown to the Court and returned). I can tender it as a defence exhibit if the Court promises to allow me to replace it later on by a photo copy or by a true copy. The original document would be of more use to me than to the Court or the Prosecution.

The document is in German. It is in the form of a credential for my work with a certain firm from 1st July, 1927 to 1st December 1928. It is dated 1st December 1928, because the contract which I had with the firm terminated on that day: that is why it is postdated.

In closing my statement I may reiterate what I said at the outset that I admit having committed the five 'acts' which I enumerated at the beginning of my statement. I claim they do not constitute a conspiracy or a crime but merely the practice of the most ordinary rights.

Q. What about your defence witnesses ?

A. I shall specify at a later stage.

Q. You have now read over your statement and it has been corrected and amended and where requested by you. Are you now satisfied that it is correct ?

A. Yes.

Sd. R. L. Yorke.
2.10.31.

Sd. G. Adhikari.
2-10-31.

Certified that the above is a full and true record of accused's statement taken down by stenographers in my presence and hearing, and subsequently transcribed by them and corrected and amended as and where requested by the accused and admitted by him to be correct.

Sd. R. L. Yorke.
2-10-31.

In the Court of R. L. Yorke Esqr., J.C.S. Addl. Sessions Judge
MEERUT.

In the case of King-Emperor Vs. P. Spratt and others,
Examination of H.L. Hutchinson accused under section
342 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1898, made before me R.L.
Yorke Addl. Sessions Judge at Meerut on the 16th day of
July 1931.

My name is Hugh Lester Hutchinson; my father's name is
Richard Hutchinson; I am by caste British; 26 years of age; by
occupation Journalist; my home is at Manchester (England), I
reside at Manchester.

Q. You heard your statement in the Lower Court P. 2602
read over to you on 16.3.31. Is that statement correct?

A. Yes.

Q. The following is the evidence which is alleged to
connect you with the alleged conspiracy. I give it in the groups
into which I have divided it up.

I. European Connections P. 1041, 1040, 1811 C, 1512,
1810 P.

II. Activities and Connections in India.

(1) Study Circle. P.W. 193, P 1029, 1030, 1021.

(2) Youth League. P.W. 269, P. 1694, 1055, 1038, 1693,
1054, 1692, 1507, 1695.

(3) Articles and notes alleged to be in your own hand-
writing: P. 1032, 1036, 1037, 1586, 1589, 1988 & (1), 1585, 1592.

(4) Articles by others: P. 1042, 1034, 1035, 1039, 1033,
P.W.s 197, 187, 262.

(5) Miscellaneous. P. 639, 658, 1587 (1), 869, 879, 1591,
1020, 1021, 1023, 1025, 1031, 1669.

(6) W.P.P. Connection: — P. 1022, 1028, 1027 and 1026.
Have you anything to say about this evidence or any portions
of it?

A. I come of a family of Revolutionary Socialists. My
father, Richard Hutchinson, who died in 1917, after witnessing
the great victory of the proletariat in Russia, is still well remembered
for his work in connection with the Socialist Labour Party, and I

am certain that if he had lived he would have been a prominent member of the Communist Party of Great Britain today. The Communist Party of Great Britain, however, was only founded in 1920, and I have said before that my father died in 1917. The activities of my mother are well-known to the Prosecution and the Government, who have been considerably embarrassed and exposed by her. She is a prominent member of the Communist Party of Great Britain. Thus from a very early age I was taught to hate those who exploit and oppress the world's toiling masses; I was brought up in such a healthy atmosphere of revolutionary socialism that all the snobbery of a public school and university failed to dispel it.

I was aged 10 when the War broke out in 1914, and was only 14 when it ended. Yet in spite of my youth the realities of War were clearly brought home to me. When conscription was thrust on the English people in 1916, both my father and mother took an active part in the No-Conscription—Fellowship movement. My father, himself, who was seriously ill, was exempted from military service but several relatives and most of our friends and associates were thrown into Jail and hideously maltreated, as conscientious objectors. In this connection I had my first glimpse of a prison, when I was taken to see one of my uncles, Hugh Hutchinson, who was then serving a long sentence in Walton Jail, Liverpool, for refusing to kill German workers for the benefit of capitalism.

At this time, I was a boarder in a large private school, which catered for "the sons of gentlemen." The Headmaster was a patriotic brute who, as is usual with patriotic brutes, exercised his great physical strength by indiscriminate flogging. Being too old to fight himself in France, he spent his time inducing young men to do so. He also insisted that his pupils should "do their bit" as he expressed it, and strike a blow against "the God-forsaken Huns" for the glory of God, King and Country. We were told that we could do our bit by getting money from our parents to buy War certificates, and he introduced a system of weekly collections. He also instituted an Officer's Training Corps under the command of a retired ranker Captain with himself, being an Honorary Lieutenant, second in command. To his horror and pious indignation I refused either to buy War certificates or to "enlist" in his cadet corps. Accordingly I was deemed a 'pro-Hun', and the Headmaster conspired with the other masters in an attempt to make my life miserable. Throughout this period I had to suffer the gibes, sneers and undeserved punishments of the Headmaster, his unpleasant wife and the

masters. Eventually, when they realised that I had no intention of giving way, this persecution stopped and I was left in comparative peace. After the death of my father—his death having been hastened by military harassment—I went to a well-known Quaker Public School at Bootham, York, where the system of education was much more intelligent and advanced, and where there was no special stigma put on “conscientious objectors.”

After leaving school I went to Switzerland where I studied at the University of Neuchatel and later for a short time at Geneva. I was in Switzerland in 1923, when the Soviet envoy to an International Conference, comrade Vorowski, was murdered in Geneva with the complicity of the Swiss Government, by a homicidal lunatic, named Conradi. I obtained my first good example of class justice when this self-confessed murderer ~~was~~ was honourably acquitted by the Swiss Courts amidst the plaudits of the Swiss bourgeoisie. Returning from Switzerland I pursued my studies for a short time at Edinburgh University, was for a time a school-master, and finally adopted journalism as a profession and went to Germany.

I had been for some time a keen student of Economics and Politics and had convinced myself, by my studies, of the fundamental correctness of Marxism and of the historical inevitability of Communism: I became a convinced Communist although the nomadic life I was then leading in connection with my studies prevented me from joining the Communist Party of Great Britain. Although not a worker, I had had an opportunity of closely observing industrial conditions, as my home was in England's biggest industrial centre—Lancashire. Further-more I was in England in 1926 during the General Strike, in which I played a small part on behalf of the strikers, and I then had active experience of the potential, mighty revolutionary force of the millions of Britain's exploited workers. Capitalism in England was panic-stricken and eventually attempted to intimidate the workers by baton charges and military demonstrations etc. The workers were unintimidated, and under the right kind of revolutionary leadership they would have won a great proletarian victory in the very stronghold of capitalism and Imperialism. Unfortunately, they were led for the most part by traitors, renegades and Imperialist lackeys of the type of Clynes, J. P. Thomas and other official Labour leaders. That great Socialist, that pious humbug, Ramsay MacDonald had run away during the General Strike to take a holiday in the Sahara and his place was taken by that great strike-breaker, David Lloyd-George. These scoundrels betrayed the British workers into a

big defeat instead of what should have been a tremendous victory. In spite of this the political lesson of the British General Strike of 1926 is of vast importance to the British workers. When the next big crisis in the class-struggle appears in England, MacDonald and his gang will be relegated to their proper place—the dung-heap of history.

While I was in Germany I had the opportunity to witness the appalling conditions of the German workers, who had not only to provide profits for their own capitalist exploiters but who also had to pay the War indemnities, regulated by the Dawes and now the Young Plan, of Germany to the Allies. In order to pay these indemnities vast quantities of cheap industrial goods must be produced; and in order to produce these commodities cheaper than other nations German workers have to work longer hours on less wages. Consequently they live in semi-starvation and have become revolutionary. Hence the Police terrorism which rages in Germany but which I propose to deal with later.

My studies, together with my personal experiences, therefore, convinced me that the present system of Society, based on the brutal and unscrupulous exploitation and robbery of the majority by a fat and bloated minority was a rotten society which had to be ruthlessly destroyed in favour of an organised, scientific, classless society of equal workers. I realised the force behind Gustav Flaubert's remark that "hatred of the bourgeoisie is the beginning of virtue."

While I was in Berlin, I came into contact with the Head Office of the League against Imperialism. I did not, as the Prosecution allege, do any work for the League, nor I was a member of it. I was merely there as a sympathetic observer, because I realised that the League against Imperialism—which, by the way, is not a Communist body—was doing splendid work on behalf of the oppressed millions in the colonial and semi-colonial countries. I naturally strongly supported any organisation which was out to fight Imperialism, and the League against Imperialism being the only militant purely anti-Imperialist association in Europe interested me greatly.

At the League, I met several friends from colonial countries, such as Java, Indo-China, Syria and in particular India. From the talks I had with the Indians I met—who were not Communists—I was anxious to know more about India, and began to study the conditions in that country and establish contacts, I mean of course personal contacts. I then began to contribute occasional articles to the Indian Nationalist Press from Berlin. Articles of mine

written in Berlin were published in the "People" of Lahore (edited by the late Lala Lajpat Rai), the "Hindu" of Madras and the "Forward" of Calcutta. Finally on September 1st, 1928 I left Europe for India to see for myself how Imperialism feeds on its prey. I was not sent out by any organisation either Communist or otherwise.

My connection with Bradley.

I arrived in India after the termination of the famous General Strike of the Bombay Textile workers of 1928. I was interested to hear of the heroic fight put up by the workers of Bombay against incredibly bad living conditions and wholesale victimisation. I had also heard of the activities of the Girni Kamgar Union, as the only textile union in Bombay which worked only for and in the interests of the masses. I wished to know more about it.

With this object in view, I visited one morning a meeting of the Mill Strike Inquiry Committee, presided over by Sir Charles Fawcett, as I had seen the announcement in the press. It was at this meeting that I made the acquaintance of Mr. Bradley. I discussed the previous mill strikes with him, and subsequently I occasionally met him; once he showed me round the mill area, where I had an opportunity of seeing the miserable chawls and the half-starved desperate appearance of workers who earned between 10 and 25 rupees a month.

The Prosecution in order to prove my connection with Bradley have put into exhibit two of my visiting cards, and an alleged letter from me to Bradley (P 1669), in which I am supposed to have announced that I had not been able to meet him on the previous day, but would try and do so in the near future. To establish connection between two individuals does not constitute a conspiracy between them for any illegal purpose. There is nothing in evidence to show that either I knew Bradley or that Bradley knew me for any illegal purpose. That we had the same political opinions is no proof of conspiracy to do any illegal act. The Prosecution have also put in P 1035 and P 1039, which have already I think been explained by Mr. Bradley. I had asked him to prepare for me a brief history of the Bombay Mill Strike, which, as a journalist, I saw had value. It is possible, although I am not sure, I do not remember exactly, that these two exhibits were this brief history. Recently reading through these exhibits I have seen that there is nothing of a seditious or incriminating nature in them. It is simply a history of a previous strike which any body acquainted with the facts could have written.

Study Circle

At about this time, I started a Study Circle composed of a few students, in order, to use the words of the Committal Order, "to study social, economic and political questions." Much has been made by the Prosecution and by the Committing Magistrate of the Study Circle, and this is the main evidence to justify a case against me for "conspiring to deprive the King of his sovereignty over British India." It had not taken long for me to see that in India, "the brightest jewel of the British Crown," there was no freedom of thought, press or speech. Things which were perfectly legal in all the bourgeois democracies of the world, particularly in England, were here regarded as terrible crimes entailing atrocious sentences of imprisonment. Even apart from revolutionary activities, I saw that it was sufficient only to express views which did not happen to coincide with those of the Government to get sentences by the Imperialist courts to long terms of imprisonment in mediaeval jails. Practically all literature of progressive thought was banned under the Sea Customs Act, and there was an organised attempt on the part of the Government to keep India isolated from all expressions of the development of society outside.

Consequently opinions—not of an extraordinary nature—expressed by me in casual conversation with students and other youths, aroused their interest and because they expressed a wish to know more of political and economic developments outside India, and because they wished to understand the theory of Marx, Leninism and Communism in general, I suggested that we should meet regularly and discuss and study these questions. And this led to the formation of the Study Circle which seems to have frightened the Government so much, that practically on the strength of it I am now facing a charge under 121 A I.P.C.

The fact that the main evidence adduced by the Prosecution to support a charge under 121 A, is that of forming a Study Circle in order to study "social, economic and political questions," is in itself a striking commentary on the ultra-Czarist repression of free political thought carried on by the British Government in India, as well as being an example of its unparalleled unscrupulousness in framing charges against people whose political opinions cause them some inconvenience. I have not the slightest doubt that even if the Study Circle had been for the purpose of studying Archaeology or Astronomy or the lives and customs of the early Moghul Emperors the fact that the Government were afraid of my political opinions would have caused the Prosecution with their usual ingenuity to point out the extremely seditious and conspiratorial nature of such studies.

As it happened the book which the Study Circle had the audacity to study was "Leninism" by Stalin.

So much importance has been placed by the Prosecution and the Committing Magistrate on this book that "it is necessary to devote a little time to its real nature. Thus the late Mr. Langford James in his Opening Address in the Lower Court says in connection with this Circle: "...and the book which they were concentrating upon at one time was that admirable book by Mr. Stalin on Leninism, and anybody who has read Stalin's "Leninism" will know exactly what news Tenacity, Sagacity, Equality and so on were imbibing." In the first place it is well-known that comrade Stalin, is one of the most prominent of the old Russian Bolsheviks, who has distinguished himself both in revolutionary theory and practice. Because of this international prominence he is termed by the bourgeois press the "dictator of Soviet Russia". The late Mr. Langford James even went so far as to accuse us of attempting to replace the Government of his Majesty in India "by that of Mr. Stalin". This is perfectly absurd. In the Workers' State of the U. S. S. R. no individual can possibly, however prominent, be "a dictator." The only "dictator" in Russia is the Proletariat. All individuals in the Workers' State are controlled by an organised and disciplined Communist Party which is the organisation of the Proletariat. All individual Communists, whatever position of trust they are in, are subject to this stern party discipline, which does not hesitate to take the most drastic measures when necessary. We have the example of Trotsky, a man of great international fame, of a striking revolutionary past; a man who had organised the victory of the Red Army over the Allied interventionists and Russian White Guards, and a man whose personal prestige among the working class of the world was very great: this man, once he continually and seriously broke the party discipline and showed signs of adopting a Bonapartist role, was uncompromisingly expelled from the Communist Party and ultimately from Russia itself. In face of this and other well-known examples, it is sheer stupidity to think that any individual can play the role of a "dictator" in Soviet Russia. Comrade Stalin is the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Russian Communist Party, and among other works he has written the book "Leninism" which is an issue in this case.

The copy of Stalin's "Leninism" which the Police found in my possession is Ex. P 1021 in this case. You, Sir, have made the following note in the deposition of P. W. 193 (Liaquat Husain): "All references are to George Allen and Unwin Ltd.'s Edition of Stalin's "Leninism" of which P 1021 is an example." Now, George

Allen and Unwin Ltd., is a very respectable firm of bourgeois publishers in London, who specialise in publishing books of political and economic interest. The publications of George Allen and Unwin Ltd., are not proscribed in India nor is this particular book of Stalin proscribed. The complainant in this case, Mr. R. A. Horton, filed two lists of proscribed books in the Lower Court (which were conveniently withdrawn in this Court) which do not include either Stalin's "Leninism" or the publications of George Allen and Unwin Ltd. Furthermore, the evidence of Liaqat Husain (P.W193) clearly shows that this particular book was openly on sale and exhibited in all the windows of the big respectable bookshops of Bombay. Thus he admits in answer to one of my questions that: " "Leninism" by Stalin is on sale in bookshops in Bombay." And again he says: "I had seen Stalin's "Leninism" in shop windows but had not read it." In fact I remember reading a leading article on this book contained in the Imperialist "Times of India" some time in December 1928, in which readers were advised to read and study this work of Stalin, in order to understand the principles and theory of Communism. This was the time when the Imperialist press was raising the Communist "bogey" in preparation for the Public Safety Bill. Again on the cover of this edition of George Allen and Unwin Ltd., (P 1021), which was found with me, there is a note by the publishers giving the reasons for publishing this work of comrade Stalin. He states among other things that "..... Russian emigres and even the most cheerful optimists among those who prefer the rival system of the West, have ceased to prophesy a successful counter-revolution from hour to hour. Instead of prophesying people wish to understand. One of the most essential ways of studying such a system is to learn how a man who lives, and moves and has his being in it regards it. Better still, if the exponent is the leading statesman in the realm which embodies it. Stalin's 'Leninism' is clearly and simply written and admirably fulfils this purpose."

It is therefore clear that the Prosecution case against me chiefly rests on the fact that I formed a Study Circle which studied not only a non-proscribed book, but one which was openly on sale in the bookshops, and recommended to the public by a big Imperialist newspaper and a very respectable firm of bourgeois publishers.

Nevertheless, even in the face of these facts, I am accused of using this book and its teaching for the purpose of—to borrow the illiterate and absurd expression of the junior prosecuting counsel—"debauching" the youth of India. Evidently in the very unimportant opinion of the junior prosecuting counsel, to teach the principles of Marxism and Communism to the youth is to

"debauch" them. To teach them the elements of political economy, of Marxism, of materialist philosophy and of the iniquities of the present ruling-class, is in the opinion of Mr. J. P. Mitter and his masters "debauching" the youth of India. All that I can hope is that such "debauchery" proves successful and helps to bring the youth of India actively into the struggle against Imperialism under the hegemony of the working class.

The only evidence of the Study Circle was supplied by a certain Liaquat Husain (P. W. 193) who, the Prosecution alleges, was a member of this circle. He is clearly a vacillating, unreliable youth, whose chief characteristic is timidity and weakness. I do not blame him for consenting to give evidence against me, as I realise that he had not the strength of character to oppose Police intimidation and family pressure. But I certainly and unreservedly blame him for not telling the truth when he was in the witness-box; for allowing himself to be tutored by either the Police or the Prosecution—I know not which—in his answers before this Court. I say that I do not know whether he was tutored by the Police or the Prosecution or by both, but one thing I can definitely state that he has been tutored by one of these agencies. He admits having a long and private conversation with Khan Bahadur Petigara, the Deputy Commissioner of Police in Bombay, before he gave his evidence; on the other hand he admits meeting Mr. Horton and Mr. Khairat Nabi before he gave his evidence. Of these two alternatives I leave the choice to your Honour.

I shall submit at a later stage that the evidence of Liaquat Hussain is full of contradictions and distortions, and has been completely shaken in cross-examination.

Now this very dubious evidence given in the Lower Court by this Liaquat Hussain enabled the Committing Magistrate to incorporate into his order the following ridiculous remark: "And the main work chosen for study was Stalin's Leninism. They continued this till they came to the chapter on "Strategy and Tactics". At this point Liaquat Hussain made a startling discovery: he did not mind studying the theory, but now he was being taught the practice of Communism. This was too much for him. He promptly resigned..." The Magistrate wrote this masterpiece of illogical absurdity in order to suggest that the object of the Study Circle was not only to study Communism, but also to study the practice of Communism. How it is possible to study the theory of Communism without understanding the theory of the strategy and tactics that Communists had employed in the past and recommended for the future, requires the brain of an Imperialist judicial officer to comprehend.

Liaqat Hussain states in his evidence that the activities of the Study Circle, "were merely study". The Magistrate's pseudo-dialectical reasoning amounts to this: When is study not study? When it is a question of studying historical tactics and strategy—then study becomes practice. A child could see the absurdity of such reasoning.

Liaqat Hussain states that he resigned from the Study Circle because he "did not entirely agree with what they were doing, that is with the later developments of the course. Also they wanted us to meet the Labour Leaders." In the Lower Court he was more explicit. Then he stated that he resigned because the Circle was studying the practice of Communism and was therefore abandoning theory. That Mir Liaqat Hussain is a liar when he gives these reasons for his resignation is borne out by his answers to certain questions put by Mr. D. P. Sinha in his cross-examination. Then he states: "Up to the time when I moved a resolution for changing the time of the Meetings I had not developed any dislike for the activities of the Circle. The activities were merely study." It is obvious from this that because he did not get his own way in the Circle, because he was bound to attend the meeting of the Circle at a definite time which did not suit his convenience, in pique he resigned. It is for this and no other reason that Mir Liaqat Hussain resigned.

To prove the activities of the study Circle there are two exhibits P 1029, P 1030. I do not admit that these two exhibits are correct or genuine minutes of the meetings of the Study Circle. Nevertheless, since the Prosecution rely on them I am entitled, while questioning their accuracy, to refer to them. In P 1029 we find a further proof of my explanation of the real causes for the resignation of Liaqat Hussain in the shape of a resolution supposed to have been passed on Sunday, January 27th 1929 against the said Liaqat Hussain. It runs as follows: "That this meeting of the Executive considers Fraternity's inability to attend these last two meetings and that his indifferent attitude and wrong mentality towards the Circle, as well as his negligence in not notifying in writing the Secretary of his absence as required to do by the constitution, calls for severe condemnation. The Circle considers it to be in the interest of Fraternity to issue to him such a warning as may check his wavering mentality." A little later, on the 6th of February 1929, there is the following resolution:—"Fraternity proposed that on Sundays the meetings of the Circle should be held from 3 to 5 to enable members to attend any other social meetings that may be useful. The motion was put to vote and thrown out". Fraternity is the supposed pseudonym of Liaqat Hussain in the Circle given by him in his deposition.

I have dealt with the resignation of Liaqat Hussain in some detail for two reasons. Firstly to show that the reasons he gave in his evidence for resigning were lies, and secondly to show that he had reason to be hostile, and therefore was amenable to Prosecution or Police tutoring.

In his Committal Order the Magistrate further states: "That this was not an instance of isolated work, which, however reprehensible could not be brought under the head of conspiracy, is shown by the fact that a frequent visitor to the Circle, which incidentally was held at Khar, was Amir Haidar Khan, the absconding accused and a member of the C. P. I. (P 1297). And on one occasion at Hutchison's suggestion, the Circle decided to get in touch with Bradley. This definitely links up the study Circle with the Communist group of Bombay."

Therefore according to the Committing Magistrate this Study Circle activity by itself could not be brought under the head of conspiracy, and the whole case as far as the Study Circle is concerned depends upon whether it was visited by Comrade Bradley and Comrade Khan.

The evidence on which the Magistrate makes this assumption is exceedingly vague and meagre. In the alleged minute book (P 1029) and (P 1030) there are the following entries which are the basis of this assumption:- (P1029) Sunday, January the 27th:.... (4) that the members of the circle should now directly get into touch with Comrade B, and others."

February the 3rd 1929 ".....The Executive Committee of the circle met at N-R-on Sunday the 3rd February 1929, but the business was postponed to the next meeting due to the presence of Comrade K—who did not belong to the circle."

February the 10th 1929.....Tenacity gave a talk on comradely behaviour. Comrade K—also spoke on the same subject. Then in P. 1030 we find on February 3rd 1929: "The Circle met at N—R—on Sunday the 3rd February 1929. Comrade K—gave his interpretation of the kidnapping scare in Bombay....."

These mysterious references to Comrade B and Comrade K were solved to the satisfaction of the Prosecution by the evidence of the unreliable Liaqat Hussain. Liaqat Hussain states that Comrade B is no other than Comrade Bradley and Comrade K is no other than Comrade Amir Haidar Khan.

The whole Prosecution case rests on whether Comrade B really means Bradley, and whether Comrade K really means Khan. I categorically deny.

Let us deal first with the case of the mysterious Comrade B. But before doing so I will mention that Comrade B is made Bradley and Comrade K is made Khan solely on the evidence of Liaquat Hussain who as I have already shown is hostile and unreliable. There is no corroborative evidence.

In the first place in cross-examination Liaquat Hussain admits that while Bradley had been mentioned at previous and other meetings he "never actually met Bradley accused." Furthermore even Liaquat Hussain is not definite on this point. He says, "I think Comrade B refers to Bradley accused as *he and others had been talked about.*" This is important. Since Liaquat Hussain admits never having met Bradley, it follows that while Liaquat Hussain was a member of the Circle—i.e. until February 1929 one month before Bradley was arrested—Bradley never attended any meeting of the Study Circle and after his resignation there is no evidence for me to meet that Bradley attended any meeting of the circle. Yesterday during the examination of Mr. Bradley the Senior Prosecuting Counsel drew his attention to an exhibit P. 638, which purports to be a diary belonging to Mr. Bradley, in which the Prosecution allege Mr. Bradley had written that he visited Khar on June the 27th, 1929. Mr. Kemp hinted that he was going to argue that on this date, when Bradley is supposed to have visited Khar, there was held according to P. 1029, a meeting of the Study Circle in which it was decided "to get in touch with Comrade B and others." Now at this time Liaquat Hussain was still a member according to his own deposition of the Study Circle, and yet he says in his evidence that he never "actually met Bradley accused." This proves that if Bradley visited Khar on such a date, it was certainly not to participate or visit a meeting of the Study Circle. I may mention here that on two occasions Bradley had visited me at Khar in the evening for the purpose of having dinner with me. This may have been one of these occasions—I do not remember—but certainly while Bradley was with me at Khar there was no meeting of any Study Circle nor were any of the students there.

Then Liaquat Hussain is *not sure* that Comrade B means Bradley. He only *thinks* so because Comrade Bradley and others had been "talked about" previously. The Prosecution will attempt to meet this argument by pointing out that in answer to rather indiscreet questions by one of the defence counsel, Liaquat Hussain said in this Court, referring to the use of the same expression in the Lower Court *and not in this Court*, that "When I say 'I think' it is more or less a mannerism. The word 'I think' is not meant to qualify the statement made." This statement, I suggest, would never have been made if it had not been

pointed out to him by counsel, and if he had not been invited to make a statement on this. Liaqat Hussain realised that his vagueness was injuring the case of his friends of the Prosecution, and therefore tried to rectify his position. I suggest that such a late rectification—at the eleventh hour—has no value. Again, this rectification does not affect the statement made in this Court, which I quoted above, because in addition to the word "think" he further adds a qualifying phrase that he was of the opinion that Comrade B means Comrade Bradley because "he and others had been talked about" previously. Such evidence is worthless. It has not been proved that Comrade B is Comrade Bradley, and I here state that the suggestion that it is so is false.

Then as regards Comrade K, Liaqat Husain says "The Comrade K mentioned in these minutes was introduced to me as Mr. Khan. The man depicted in Ex. 1067 shown to me is the same person." Of course, it is needless for me to say that here again Liaqat Husain is lying with his usual fluency. Even supposing that Comrade K was introduced to him as Khan—which is false—Khan is a very common name in India—there must be more than a million Khans. Liaqat Husain did *not* say that Comrade K was introduced to him as *Comrade Amir Haidar Khan*, but merely as Comrade Khan. Then Liaqat Husain also makes a significant admission in this Court, when cross-examined by Mr. Sinha. He says "The business was postponed because Comrade K had nothing to do with the Circle and was an outsider." In other words this mysterious Comrade K was 'persona non grata' in the Study Circle. Now I suggest that if this Comrade K means Comrade Amir Haidar Khan, as suggested by the Prosecution, is it likely, according to their own case, that he should be excluded from a sympathetic body as an "outsider"?

As regards the recognising of an alleged photograph of Amir Haidar Khan by Liaqat Husain as the Khan whom he knew in the Study Circle, I would point out that in his evidence in the Lower Court he was not sure. He then said that "I *think* that P. 1067 is a photo of Mr. Khan." Naturally when his mistake had been pointed out to him he attempted to make another eleventh hour rectification as he did in the case of Comrade B, while giving his evidence in this Court. I submit that on the strength of the above arguments the Prosecution case on the Study Circle falls. There is no proof that Comrade B is Comrade Bradley or that Comrade K is Comrade Amir Haidar Khan. Therefore there is no evidence to prove that either Comrade Bradley or Comrade Khan had any connection with the Study

Circle. The Prosecution may argue what they like at a later stage but there is no evidence to support their case on this matter, on the contrary the natural inference to be drawn from the evidence placed before the Court is that Comrades Bradley and Khan had no connection with this Circle.

While I have shown that there is no evidence of association with any of my fellow accused which is essential for a charge of conspiracy—as far as this Study Circle is concerned, I wish to make it perfectly clear that I do not regard such an association as wrong. Of course it may be wrong—I do not know yet—under the Indian Penal Code. I have, however, no respect for the Indian Penal Code which is not a natural law but the law of a gang of oppressors and exploiters. I believe that I would have been perfectly justified in establishing connection with what the Magistrate calls “the Communist group in Bombay.” I did not do so because it was unnecessary. This Study Circle was a small concern of my own and not one of my fellow accused was even aware that it existed. But if I had found that their help and assistance had been necessary, I should not have hesitated for a single moment before asking for their assistance. This, however, does not help the Prosecution. As it happens there is no proof of association in connection with the Study Circle. If Imperialism wanted to try me for conspiracy on the strength of it, they should have tried me for conspiring with the members of the Study Circle itself and not with the present accused. Such a conspiracy case would have proved interesting on a charge of “conspiring to deprive the King of his sovereignty over British India” by forming a Study Circle to study ‘social, economic and political questions’. It is a pity that the Government which seems to have a flair for making itself ridiculous by starting conspiracy cases which turn out to be farces, had not thought of this. That is all on the Study Circle.

Hand-Writing.

Liaquat Husain gives evidence on one other point—my handwriting. He and Colonel Rehman are the only two witnesses who have been asked to prove my handwriting. Neither of them can be called “handwriting experts”—though how a man becomes a “handwriting expert” I still fail to understand—and neither of them had much opportunity to recognise my handwriting. The so-called “handwriting expert” Mr. Stott does not deal with me at all. It is not sufficient for you, Sir, to exercise your commonsense in recognising my handwriting. For instance, I may have written applications to you and from this you yourself may think yourself able by using commonsense to decide yourself which documents

are in my handwriting and which are not. Unfortunately, commonsense is quite useless in this matter. If proving handwriting only depended upon the exercise of your commonsense, then there would have been no need for the Prosecution to attempt to prove the handwritings of the accused by calling the "handwriting expert" Mr. Stott and Col. Rahman and Liaquat Husain. There would have been no need for Mr. Stott's microscope and pseudo-mathematical formulae. Then again if the whole thing were left to your commonsense, you, not being a "handwriting expert" would be unable to detect the genuine from the forgeries. Nor do I believe any self-styled "hand-writing expert" to be in a better position than your Honour. The law usually rules out commonsense as irrelevant, and insists on evidence being legally and properly proved. I submit that my handwriting has not been legally and properly proved.

17. 7. 31.

Let us examine the evidence in this respect of Liaquat Hussain, in order to see what qualifications he has to justify his claim to be able to recognise my hand-writing. He states, "I *once* received a postcard from Hutchinson accused. (another lie) I *think* it was signed 'Lester'. I never received any other letter from Hutchinson accused. I have often been in Hutchinson's company and so was able to see him writing and signing. He did not submit his writings to me. I could not give any particular instance in which I saw him do so." The statement that he had often been in my company and had seen me write and sign, is much qualified by his following admission to Mr. Sinha that "I cannot say when I last saw Hutchinson accused write anything or when I first saw him write anything. I cannot give particulars of any document to which I saw him append his signature as H.L. Hutchinson." Finally he contradicts his former statement by admitting that "I am not very familiar with his hand-writing."

The evidence of Liaquat Hussain *only* amounts to this. He says he often saw me writing but could not give any particular instance of when he saw me do so, nor could he give any particulars of any document to which he saw me append my signature as H.L. Hutchinson. He further states that he has only received one postcard from me (which I have denied) and finally admits that he is not familiar with my hand-writing at all.

What sort of evidence is this? A tissue of vague and contradictory statements does not legally prove my hand-writing. In this respect as in the other the evidence of Liaquat Hussain is worthless.

Then there is Colonel Rahman. Colonel Rahman did not make any pretence of being a "hand-writing expert." For instance he says in his deposition "I cannot describe the characteristics of the hand-writing of any of the accused. I have never given evidence in regard to hand-writing except in this case..... I am not a hand-writing Expert and cannot mention any specific thing I have observed in regard to the hand-writing of any single accused..... My knowledge of the hand-writing of the accused does not enable me to give an equally definite opinion in the case of the hand-writing of each accused I have never read any book on hand-writing. I have had no experience of cases of disguised hand-writing or of forged writings. I do not think I could distinguish a forged writing from a genuine one." Colonel Rahman is quite frank. By the above statement he is admitting freely his inability to prove the hand-writing of any of the accused. When his knowledge of the hand-writing of the accused was put to the test in this Court, he failed dismally to recognise different writings. I do not however propose to enter into this here, as it is a matter for later argument. I will content myself by saying that Colonel Rahman's evidence in this Court was completely shaken in cross-examination and makes a sorry record, in spite of the attempts of the Court to bolster up the evidence by the insertion of many uncalled-for notes. It is also worth noting that both Colonel Rahman and Liaqat Husain failed to recognise my alleged signature on P 1043. As far as my hand-writing is concerned the evidence of Colonel Rahman is quite as dubious as that of Liaqat Husain.

While on this point, I might mention that the Prosecution has not been over scrupulous in attempting to prove signatures and hand-writing. Both in this and the Lower Court, alleged applications to the Court have been put in as evidence; the Jail Superintendent, Colonel Rahman, a man who is supposed to be in a position of confidence, has been brought to try to prove letters purporting to have been written from the Jail after the commencement of this case.

Finally there is the evidence of P.W. 178, Mr. Joti Swarup. Mr. Joti Swarup is the Head Assistant to the complainant in this case, and he is brought to prove my signature. I regret that I shall have to speak rather plainly on this evidence. The story told by Mr. Swarup as to how he obtained my signature throws much light on the methods of the Prosecution. According to him I applied to the Committing Magistrate for the return of some of my unexhibited material. When this material was returned to me I had to give a receipt, although Mr. Joti Swarup admits that

" I did not warn them that these receipts might be used in evidence against them." He also says that "I should not have given the articles to the accused if they had not first given me receipts for them."

He then is supposed to have endorsed my alleged receipt as " written in my presence by accused Hutchinson " (P. 2330). He admits that this endorsement was not written in my presence. He reasons for these discreditable manoeuvres are very simple. He says "I had some idea that I might have to give evidence about these hand-writings" although "I had not received any orders or instructions about it. " Again he continues to admit his iniquitous career as a trickster by stating "...I often receive receipts from various people. I do not always write that the receipt was written in my presence. In fact I do not remember any such case. I did so in this case because I had some idea that standard hand-writings might be required."

If this story of Joti Swarup is correct then it gives a very pretty picture of that judicial impartiality and fair-play which is so often talked about for the deception of the ignorant. It is, first of all, an admission that all the exhibits and unexhibited material in this case were under the control and subject to the orders of the complainant. It is also an admission that the Prosecution do not hesitate to stoop to methods which would shame a card-sharper or a race-course tout. Mr. Swarup boasts that he carried out his strategy to obtain "standard hand-writing" of the accused on his own and "without instructions from Mr. Horton, Khaifrat Nabi, Langford James or Mitter." If this is so then Mr. Swarup is to be congratulated on possessing a mentality which a pick-pocket would be ashamed of possessing. If the Prosecution are going to rely on Mr. Swarup's story of Ex. P. 2330, then they must admit at the same time the above discreditable story, which reflects not only on Mr. Swarup, but on the Prosecution and the Court itself. Besides this, it does not help them very much, because a man who would stoop to such trickery would not hesitate at forgery, if he saw a chance of promotion at the end of it. If on the other hand the Prosecution wish to avoid this discredit and repudiate Mr. Swarup, then Mr. Swarup's evidence as to my writing and signature is non-existent. It is for the Prosecution to decide.

Accordingly my hand-writing has not been properly proved, and therefore the alleged letter which I am supposed to have written to Nambiar in Berlin, foreseeing my arrest (P. 1810), is

not properly proved to have been written by me and therefore I have no need to explain it.

Letters.

While on the subject of letters, I might as well say what I have got to say about those which you have included in your question.

P. 1014 purports to be a letter in typescript to me from William Paul, the editor of the "Sunday Worker." It is dated October 15th, 1927, and is addressed to me care of the League against Imperialism. There is nothing incriminating in the contents of this letter; there is merely a request from Comrade Paul to supply articles and photographs, if I am working for the League against Imperialism, for publication in the "Sunday Worker." The object of the Prosecution in putting in this letter is to show, in the words of the Committing Magistrate, that I "was of the same school of thought as the 'Sunday Worker', one of the organs of the C.P.G.B." And also that I was connected with the League against Imperialism. To begin with I have already explained my connection with the League against Imperialism, and the "Sunday Worker" was not an organ of the C.P.G.B. It was a Left Wing paper which took contributions from Left socialists and Communists impartially. Secondly, while I am sorry to disappoint the Prosecution, I can not admit this letter as I do not remember having received it. The letter is typed and the signature "William Paul" is not written but stamped. It is open to any person to misuse a stamped signature of somebody else. A stamped signature is no signature at all.

P. 1040 purports to be a letter from one Binnie to Gunnu. As my name is neither Binnie nor Gunnu, and as I am not mentioned in the letter, I am afraid that I know nothing about it.

As for P. 1811 and P. 1512, they are also not letters written to me or by me, and I know nothing about them.

P. 1512 I saw for the first time yesterday, and was at a loss to discover how I can be connected with an alleged letter from M.N. Roy to a firm of Calcutta publishers. It in no way concerns me.

Youth League.

I had not been long in India before I became interested in the Youth League Movement. I was first of all struck by the energy and political enthusiasm which I saw was wasted in the channels of Gandhian futility. I attempted to awaken them to the

fundamental reactionary policy of the Congress. I attempted to point out that the Congress stood for compromise with Imperialism on a basis of combined exploitation of the masses of India. I attacked the futile activity with which the Youth League was wasting energy, of boycotting foreign cloth, acting as the unpaid salesmen of Khaddar and Swadeshi, and picketing liquor shops—the futility of which has been already dealt with by other accused. I also attempted to draw the attention of the Indian youth to the theories of Marx and Lenin and to the fact of the class-struggle. Under the auspices of the Bombay Youth League I often made speeches dealing with these particular subjects.

Speeches.

My speeches fall into two categories—those made before March 15th 1929, the date of the filing of the general complaint in this case and those made after that date. As regards the latter I am going to argue at a later stage that they are inadmissible in evidence under section 10 of the Indian Evidence Act.

According to the Committal Order only two speeches were made by me before March 20th—the first at the Jinnah Hall on the 3rd of February 1929 and the second at Matunga on the 2nd of March 1929. I will deal later with the political views expressed in the speeches—at the moment I only wish to make a few general observations.

In the first place both the speeches were reported by Mr. Mankar (P. W. 180). Mr. Mankar, however, has not reported my speeches—he has murdered them. His cross-examination proved that he made a deplorable mess of all the speeches he reported. My speeches in particular have been so distorted, confused and jumbled by Mr. Mankar that in many places they are rendered meaningless. In fact the speeches which are reported to be mine, are in reality half mine and half Mr. Mankar's. When for instance I correctly quote Marx, Mr. Mankar makes it a point to misquote him, for which, by the way, the Committing Magistrate blames me. Then he has a very unpleasant habit of inserting his own reflections, observations and humorous comments. In short Mr. Mankar's reporting is useless, and the speeches he reported cannot be relied upon either by the Court, the Defence or the Prosecution.

Evidence of speeches is of no value in proving a charge of conspiracy, unless those speeches show association with other accused in the same case—and not always then. Such speeches may be extremely seditious, which in this case is not the fact, but they cannot

be evidence of conspiracy unless they prove association. My speeches show no such association. It is true that the Police, the Prosecution and the Committing Magistrate conspired to prove that the president at a lecture of mine at the Jinnah Hall on the 3rd February 1929 (P 1694) was no other than Comrade Shaukat Usmani. This contention—as Mr. Kemp admitted in the High Court during my bail application—has no force. Mr. Mankar destroys it. He says on cross-examination: “When I have corrections to make I generally make them in red ink. The name ‘Usmani’ at the head is not in my hand-writing; I originally typed it as Shaukat Husain but *someone else* has crossed out Husain and written Usmani, putting Husain in brackets. In my original notes Exh: P 1694 I wrote as President merely Husain. There is no mention of Shaukat Usmani in my notes or transcription as originally written.” “When in the past we have accused the Police of concocting evidence the Prosecution has been indignant. Here is an excellent example of such a Police concoction, revealed by one of their own reporters.

P 1693 is a distorted account of a speech I delivered at the Matunga Youth League on the 2nd of March 1929. Other speeches were delivered after March the 20th which I hold to be inadmissible in evidence in this case in spite of your order on the subject, in which you justified their inclusion in evidence as “showing my state of mind”.

The Committing Magistrate even quotes as evidence a speech of mine in protest against the arrest of my fellow-accused in the present case (P 1692). The views expressed in the other speeches I will explain later.

The arrests of March the 20th, 1929.

I have given a brief history of my activities up to the historic date of March 20th 1929. On that date all those Labour leaders who had been fighting only in the interests of the masses, and who had refused to betray the workers by cooperating with capitalism, were arrested by an enraged Imperialism. The object of these arrests was to break the revolutionary spirit shown by the workers in their heroic strike, and by removing revolutionary leaders, give a free hand to the Allies of capitalism and Imperialism, men like N. M. Joshi, K. C. Roy Chaudhry, Shiva Rao, Kirk, Chaman Lal etc., who, it was hoped, would bring the workers back to the path of humble suffering and patient and blind obedience. It has frequently been said that the Meerut Case is a strike-breaking prosecution and I agree with this description.

It is only natural that, faced with such a disgraceful business as the arrest of all the militant Labour leaders on a faked charge,

at the instigation of prominent capitalists in Bombay and Calcutta with this attempt to break up the Indian working-class movement, and with this gross attempt to penalise political opinion, any decent man would protest.

On March the 20th 1929, my residence was visited by the Police and searched.

I realised that it was useless to have opinions unless I was prepared to put them into practice. The Committing Magistrate writes: "Then came the arrests and Hutchinson stepped out into the open. The Bombay Youth League organised a meeting to protest against the arrests and Hutchinson spoke". My only comment on this is that I had always been "in the open". I have never attempted at any time to conceal any one of my activities. The only difference was that after the arrests March 20th I became much more active. It is also true that I spoke at a meeting to the Youth League (P 1692) to protest against these arrests—as any decent man would.

There is a short history attached to this meeting. On the previous night I had attended the meeting at the Jinnah Hall held under the auspices of the Bombay Provincial Congress Committee, to protest against "the repressive policy of Government". There was a formidable array of Congress speakers on the platform and the President was Mr. Jamnadas Mehta, then M. L. A. As the whole of India was in a ferment about the Meerut arrests I had expected that the object of the meeting would be to protest against this unparalleled interference by the Executive in Trade Union and political organisations, I was greatly mistaken. The speakers, including Mr. Jamnadas Mehta, did not even mention the Meerut accused but delivered diatribes against the Government for arresting Mahatma Gandhi for attending a bonfire of foreign cloth (Gandhi was afterwards fined Re. 1/- for this terrible offence), and exhorted the audience to protest against this repressive policy of the Government in fining Gandhi Re. 1/- by wearing khaddar. To the great annoyance of the President and other kindred spirits, Comrade Joglekar against whom there was a warrant of arrest appeared on the platform. The audience which Jamnadas and Company had lulled to sleep immediately awoke cheering and the whole atmosphere of the meeting was changed. I was asked to speak by Mr. Mehar Ali of the Youth League. I began by protesting against the impending arrest of Joglekar by the agents of class justice, when the President interrupted me and practically told me that I should confine myself to "the repressive policy of the Government"—i.e. I should confine myself to protesting against the farcical arrest of Gandhi, and should advocate the wearing of khaddar. I refused and attacked the President's

previous speech at which pandemonium broke out. As a protest against the attitude of the Official Congressites the Youth League held a special meeting the next evening at which I was invited to speak (P. 1692): It is interesting to note that the President Mr. Jamnadas Mehta who tried his best to sabotage any demonstration in favour of the arrested Labour leaders, today is himself aspiring to be a labour leader", but he wishes to emasculate the whole Labour Movement in India and destroyed its militant character.

The New Spark.

At the beginning of May 1929 I started the New Spark. It was an independent, anti-Imperialist paper and not an organ of any party organisation. As I was its editor, it is only natural that it should have a distinct Communist tendency, but it was open to contributions by non-Communists of Left views. A perusal of its contents will show this.

The following editorial note, published in the New Spark of May the 5th 1929 clearly shows the aims and objects of the paper, it runs as follows: " We desire to make it plain at the outset as to what our paper will bewhat we do intend to do, however, is to provide food for serious thinking by commenting intelligently on the political events of the week from an international standpoint, and by special articles of a definitely progressive character written by competent people in the hope of stimulating political thought in the right direction in the minds of our readers. This is essentially a paper for the thinking man who, if he is not an Imperialist, will welcome and support it in order that it may counteract the brazen propaganda carried on by the organs of the Imperialist and capitalist press." This shows the nature of the New Spark.

The same argument applies to the New Spark which applies to my speeches. The New Spark can not be evidence of conspiracy unless it proves association with the other accused in the present case. I contend that it does not. The only evidence of such association is contained in the first editorial note of the first issue of the New Spark dated May 5th 1929 connecting Mr. M. G. Desai and the Spark.

This is easily explained. I adopted the name "Spark" because of the goodwill created in Bombay by the imprisonment of Mr. M. G. Desai. The arrest of the editor of a moderate paper like the Spark was looked upon by the public in Bombay as an act of wanton repression. By adding the word "New", I wanted to indicate that my paper was independent of the old one and differed in policy.

Hence I did not adopt the sub-title of the Spark—"a socialist weekly"—as I had different intentions for my paper.

I write in my first editorial "We are happy to assure him (Desai) by this present issue that the good work he started will be continued by us until his return when we shall be glad to cooperate with him again under his editorship.

The latter part of this quotation especially was not meant as a practical proposition, as I did not look forward to an early release of Mr. Desai, knowing the Indian Bureaucracy as I did. My remark was meant as a gesture of goodwill and an expression of solidarity against Imperialist attack.

I never knew any thing about Mr. Desai except that I saw his writings in the "Spark".

The fact that I wrote articles of protest against the Meerut arrests in no way shows association. Every nationalist paper in India did so.

There is nothing particularly objectionable in the New Spark but if the Government had disapproved of it they could have tried me perhaps for sedition, but certainly it is no evidence of conspiracy.

Trade Union activities.

I had very little opportunity for working in the Trade Unions. I was elected Vice-President of G. I. P. Railwaymen's Union at the general meeting of the Union held at Chalisgaon in May 1929. Shortly afterwards I was elected Vice-President of the Girni Kamgar Union in Bombay. This did not give me much time for labour organisation, since I was arrested on June 14th, 1929. Yet in the short time that I had, I did my best to maintain the morale of the strikers in the Textile Industry in Bombay, and attempted in obedience to a resolution passed at the Chalisgaon Conference of the G. I. P. Railwaymen's Union, to organise the members of that Union in preparation for a general strike. It was while engaged in this activity that I was arrested at Nagpur after addressing a meeting of railwaymen and while on my way to another meeting.

My arrest and inclusion in this case illegal.

I was arrested on June the 14th, 1929, at Nagpur where I had gone for the purpose of organising the Railwaymen in preparation of a general strike. This was three months after the arrest of the other accused. I was brought up to Meerut from Nagpur, without having first interviewed a magistrate, and lodged in the District Jail, and pooled along with the other accused in the present

case. According to the law as it stands, there are certain grave irregularities in this procedure. They are as follows: (1) The Criminal Procedure Code requires that before an accused is tried by a Sessions Court, there shall be an enquiry by a magistrate. The enquiry provided by Chapter XVIII of the Criminal Procedure Code is a full enquiry and not a partial enquiry as in my case. I was brought into this enquiry when the most important part of the speech of the Public Prosecutor had already been delivered, and as such there was no full enquiry in my case.

(2) In March when the other accused were arrested, my house was searched, which means that the Government and the Prosecution had full information about my activities. But till then the Government of India had not ordered a complaint against me. The complainant had not applied for my arrest and I was not arrested. All this meant that my activities up to that date furnished no evidence of agreement or association, which is the essence of conspiracy under the law. This is also borne out by the fact that most of the evidence adduced against me in this trial relates to the period after the arrests of the other accused when any act in furtherance of this alleged conspiracy had become physically impossible. (3) No regular complaint was filed by the complainant against me, but he simply applied for my name being added and for warrants to be issued against me as well. This is no complaint as defined by S.4(h) of the Criminal Procedure Code. Besides this the complainant gave no reasons why I was not included in the petition of complaint filed on the 15th March 1929. (4) But if it is suggested that the evidence already at the disposal of the Police was enough, and that they had some curiosity to see how far I was ready to go, then I suggest it extremely improbable. It is certainly very unusual that having sufficient evidence at its disposal the Police refrained from taking any action simply to satisfy its curiosity as to what I would do further. (5) The sanction is not proved as required by law: (a) S. 196 Cr. P. C. specifically lays down that no court shall take cognizance of certain offences against the State unless upon complaint made by order of or under authority from the Governor General in Council, the Local Government or some officer empowered by the Governor General in Council on his behalf, (b) The sanction order was not proved either in the Inquiry court in the present court until the end when the Prosecution had already closed its case, (c) the sanction order was not properly proved as it was required to be proved in accordance with the provisions laid down in sub-section (1) of S. 78 of the Indian Evidence Act which states, I quote only a relevant portion of it; "acts, orders, or notifications of the Executive Government of British India in any of its departments etc. may be proved by the records of the departments

certified by the heads of those departments respectively," (d) in the present Sessions Court, in the absence of complainant Mr Horton, complaints and sanctions were proved by Mr. Ward, Prosecution Witness no. 281 (Superintendent of the Judicial Section in the Home Department of the Government of India), (e) the first sanction of 31 accused was signed by Mr. Haig, who was then Home Secretary. The sanction of myself and Amir Haidar Khan (dated 8th June) was signed by Mr. J. A. Woodhead, Secretary in the Commerce Department of the Government of India, (f) The signature of the Commerce Secretary was proved by a Superintendent of the Home Department. Why in the first place the Secretary of the Commerce Department should sign my sanction, I am at a loss to understand, but he having signed it, it should have been proved by a member of the Commerce Department and not of the Home Department. Therefore I contend that the sanction is not proved according to Section 78 sub-section (1) of the Indian Evidence Act. For all these reasons enumerated above my trial is ultra vires and not according to law, and I was held for nearly two years in wrongful custody.

D/-23.7.31

P 1032, 1036, 1037, 1586, 1589 are alleged to be articles, notes etc: in my hand-writing. I do not admit them. I have already explained P 639, 658, and P 1387 in dealing with my connection with Bradley.

P 869 is alleged to be a passport belonging to Mrs. Nambiar. I do not know why I should be called upon to explain it. P 879 is a visiting card of mine recovered from Mr. Jhabwala. The explanation given by Mr. Jhabwala in the Lower Court as to how he obtained my visiting card, is to the best of my knowledge correct.

P 1591 consists of cuttings from the Indian Daily Mail. The Indian Daily Mail was then owned by Mr. J.B. Petit, then President of the Mill-owners association in Bombay. He would resent very much, I am sure, any insinuation that his paper contained anything seditious or conspiratorial. I fail to understand why these cuttings on topical news should be put in as an exhibit in this case.

Then P 1023 are copies of the 'Teachers' International from May 1928 to October 1928. I believe, though I am not sure now, that I received these by post. I have no connection with any Teachers' International, nor do I know anything about that body.

P 1025 are copies of the Young Liberator, a Youth League paper edited by Mr. H. D. Rajah. It is by no means a Communist publication and its policy is guided according to the strange principles of Mahatma Gandhi. I contributed one or two articles which have been printed in this organ in the hope of being able to give to its readers a new vista of political life.

P 1020 are two issues of the Labour Monthly, which I do not remember being in my possession.

P 1031 is an extremely seditious book entitled "Palgrave's Golden Treasury". This is a book of good and bad English poetry, usually used in English elementary schools. Nearly every Englishman who has been to school will have a copy of Palgrave's Golden Treasury, and, it would be a very strange thing if merely possessing a copy of this very uninspiring book were to make one suspect of conspiring. There is no evidence put forward by the Prosecution that I used Palgrave's Golden Treasury for any other purpose than reading an indifferent collection of English verse.

To my surprise you have asked me questions about my connection with the Workers' and Peasants' Party. Because there was no evidence of such connection, the Magistrate in the Lower Court did not trouble to ask me this question. I have had not the slightest connection with the Workers' and Peasants' Party nor is there any evidence to assume such a connection. The fact that I am alleged to have possessed the Presidential address at the Workers' and Peasants' Party Conference delivered by Comrade Sohan Singh Josh, or three leaflets issued by the All-India Workers' and Peasants' Party Conference, in no way proves that I was a member of that organisation or that I had any connection with it. In fact the evidence on record shows the contrary. These leaflets were obviously meant for publicity purposes and were made available to the Public in the same way adopted by every other political party. There must be thousands of people who have received or bought such leaflets but that does not establish their connection with the Workers' and Peasants' Party.

P 1034 is an unsigned article entitled "Inter-National affiliation of the Indian Labour Movement." I did not write this article nor do I know anything about it.

P 1055 is an announcement of a lecture to be delivered by me at the Youth League at Matunga on the 2nd of March 1929. The President was announced as Mr. Manik Lal Vakil. The notice is issued by the Hony. Secretary of the Matunga Youth League. I delivered many speeches at the Matunga Youth League. It is quite possible that this is the announcement of one of them.

Q. (At suggestion of Crown Counsel). Have you anything to say about P. 1075 and P. 1588 ?

A. P. 1075 is a visiting card of mine alleged to have been found with Amir Haidar Khan. Someone has written an address on the back of it. I was in the habit of circulating my visiting cards freely before my arrest because I was not then aware that an ordinary visiting card was evidence of conspiracy. I do not know anything further about this. As far as P. 1588 is concerned I equally know nothing about it, nor do I remember it being in my possession. One observation however I would like to make is that this receipt is made out in the name of Amir Haidar Mohamud, which is quite a different name from Amir Haidar Khan.

D/17-7-31.

I now propose to make a short general statement in which I shall explain the views I have expressed in my speeches and other exhibits, and which will also serve as a political justification.

Violence.

The subject of violence is one of the most vital legal issues of the present case. Such phrases as "armed revolution," "forcible capture of the State apparatus," and "forcible destruction of the bourgeois State machine" have been made much of by the Prosecution and the Magistrate, who however, have failed to understand the Communist theory of violence.

The Committing Magistrate devotes many pages of his Committal Order to this subject with the object of justifying the complaint, and although, while he correctly disassociates Communism from Individual Terrorism,—he is rather emphatic on this point—for some reason or other he does not succeed in giving a clear or concise gist of the Communist theory of violence. His argument chiefly consists of short passages culled from various speeches and writings alleged to have been made by several of the accused, without reference to their context, and among these excerpts is a note which is alleged by the Prosecution to be mine in which I stated "by all means let us try to win freedom without bloodshed but when capitalists' interests are threatened, then they will be the first to offer violence, to try and crush the workers' revolution, and we must be prepared." (P. 1586). This bald note, which I do not admit, undoubtedly in my opinion is a correct and a very brief interpretation of what Communists understand when they speak of the necessity of violence. I therefore, consider it essential, to prevent further confusion, to explain the view-point expressed in this note in some detail, in the hope that when next

the Prosecution feel called on to submit a 42-page affidavit to the High Court on this subject, they may do so with less confusion and error.

There is nothing which horrifies the bourgeoisie more than to hear talk of a violent proletarian revolution. Violence for the intelligent bourgeois means necessarily a proletarian revolution, and all talk of it reminds them of the words of Engels that "their executioner is waiting at the door." These Socialist and Labour fakirs, these thinly disguised lackeys of capitalism and Imperialism, preach peaceful evolution of the toiling masses towards Socialism. They say that Socialism is a gradual development to be attained by the peaceful persuasion of parliamentary and constitutional action. Even the slogan "Socialism in our Time" adopted by their own Left Wing, empty of serious attention as it is, is far too radical for our MacDonald's, Henderson's, Snowden's, and Lansbury's, who are at present guiding the masses along the peaceful, evolutionary road to Socialism, by consenting to act as the hired lackeys of British capitalism in lowering the already low conditions of the British workers, in preparing by means of farcical Disarmament Conferences and secret treaties for another world war, for the glory and profit of British Imperialism, in shooting and terrorising the rank and file nationalists of India, Egypt, Samoa and other parts of the British Empire, in conspiring to crush the workers' State of the U.S.S.R., and by keeping, among other offences of like nature, the leaders of the Indian working class in jail for years, for having no faith in their empty talk of "peaceful evolution" and desiring to obtain Socialism by the only possible method—direct action. The Indian bourgeoisie—which being subject to the British bourgeoisie, has to use the masses to bring pressure on Imperialism to extort certain industrial and commercial concessions—protects private property—the basis of bourgeois *raison d'être*—by inculcating in the Indian masses the old Tolstoyan doctrine with Gandhian embellishments of "Resist not evil with force," and by the lavish distribution of soporific slogans to the masses as for example "Non-violence is our Sheet Anchor." The consequent spectacle in the recent Civil Disobedience Movement, of the Congress rank and file passively allowing a few policemen to shower lathi-blows on their heads, without thought of resistance, with the consequent reward of the Gandhi-Irwin Pact, was tragic and infuriating.

Yet this bourgeois horror of violence is only concerned with that violence which coming from its victims is directed against itself. The bourgeoisie has never at any time hesitated to employ violence when its own interests are at stake. The bourgeois State

employs its forces to shoot down, unarmed workers striking for a living wage, violence is daily employed to preserve bourgeois "law and order"—that is the inviolability of that cardinal virtue—respect for private property. Furthermore the last War 1914-1918—a war between different bourgeois States for the exploitation of the world markets—is unparalleled in history by its ferocity, butchery and inhumanity.

Nor has the bourgeoisie been backward in revolutionary violence. For the bourgeoisie has not always been the ruling class—to become so they had to throw off the yoke of feudalism and the despotic rule of landlordism. In France this was done by the great bourgeois Revolution of 1789, and the revolutionary heroes of the French bourgeoisie were, by all accounts, not backward in exerting violent terrorism against not only the aristocracy but also against their dupes—the workers—witnessed the execution of Louis XVI, the September Massacres of 1791, and the daily activity of the Guillotine which, when it had finished off all the remnants of the aristocracy available, was used on those who wished to carry the revolution forward on its original slogans of Liberty, Equality and Fraternity. In England the bourgeoisie emancipated itself from despotic landlordism by a bloody Civil War which lasted for years and culminated in 1648 with the execution of King Charles I by the bourgeoisie. It is an example of bourgeois smug hypocrisy that the direct descendants of the Roundheads who joyfully cut off the head of Charles I and established bourgeois rule, thereby forcibly depriving the king of his sovereignty over Britain, should be trying us now, with pious indignation, for conspiring to deprive the king of his sovereignty over British India.

The State.

It is impossible to understand what Communists mean by violent revolution, unless the function and the nature of the State is correctly understood. The most concise, lucid and correct work on the State is Lenin's "State and Revolution" which was quoted copiously by the late Mr. Langford James in his opening Address, as also by the Committing Magistrate in his Order, both failing to understand it.

The State has not always existed. It was a product of the break-up of tribal society into classes of opposing economic interest, whose antagonism were irreconcilable, and served the purpose of forcibly controlling the natural clashes and collisions between such opposing interests. In gentile society public power was a "self-acting armed organisation of the population" which in a class society was

obviously impossible lest opposing classes should not only destroy themselves but society itself. Hence to keep in check these irreconcilable class antagonisms a necessity arose for a public power standing above society—this public power was the State. This public power “consists not only of armed men, but also of material additions in the shape of prisons and repressive institutions of all kinds which were unknown in the gentile (clan) form of Society” (Engel’s *Origin of the Family, etc.*” quoted by Lenin). It is only natural that the State born out of the antagonisms of classes should become the State of the most powerful and economically predominant class, which thus obtains political power, which it uses to exploit and oppress the economically opposite class. “According to Marx, the State is the organ of class domination, the organ of oppression of one class by another. Its aim is the creation of order which legalises and perpetuates this oppression by moderating collisions between the classes.” (Lenin’s *State and Revolution* C. P. G. B. page 10).

History shows that the object of all revolutions has been to capture the State apparatus—that is to acquire control of the special bodies of armed men, repressive institutions etc. which constitute the State. To have control of the State machine is to have the monopoly of violence, and, therefore, as Lenin writes “...every revolution, in shattering the State machinery, demonstrates to us how the governing class aims at the restoration of the special bodies of armed men at its service, and how the oppressed class tries to create a new organisation of a similar nature, capable of serving not the exploiting but the exploited class”.

The bourgeois capitalist State has not always existed—nor has the bourgeoisie always been the ruling class. As we have pointed out before, the State power in Europe was wrested from the feudal aristocracy by means of bloody revolutions. After smashing the feudal State, the bourgeoisie organised its own State apparatus, which has developed into the modern representative State, which is an organ for the forcible exploitation of wage labour by capital.

Hence when we use the expression “forcible seizure of power” we mean capturing the bourgeois State machine as a preliminary to smashing it and establishing the workers’ State apparatus—that is Dictatorship of the Proletariat.

Our object therefore being to seize the State power, the question naturally arises as how we intend to do so. Obviously it is logically impossible to capture the fulcrum of organised violence without the use of violence. Thus realising that a successful attempt to capture and destroy the bourgeois State is definitely impossible without the use of violence, we should place

ourselves in the same hypocritical category as the Hendersons and MacDonalds if we tried to hide the fact that ultimate violence is an essential part of our theory. No revolutionary movement in history has been successful without the employ of violence and we are not blinded by any Utopian hope or by any Utopian optimism that our movement will be successful without a fight. Communists, however, are not more blood-thirsty by nature than any other human being. If it were possible to achieve our aim and object without violence, we should be delighted. The lives of the workers are very precious, we would not risk any of them unless forced to do so by political necessity.

D-18-7-31

The present system of society is based on the exploitation of the majority by the minority. The present lords of the Earth, and all that it contains, are the big capitalist trusts, combines, banks, financiers, etc: The criterion of social power is wealth, and this wealth is obtained by the forcible exploitation of the Earth's toiling millions. Capitalism has replaced chattel slavery by a worse form of oppression—wage slavery. Under capitalism, the worker does not get the value of his labour; this, of course, goes to swell the profits and dividends of his capitalist masters who for the most part lead a life of luxury and leisure paid for by the blood and sweat of the world's workers. The bourgeoisie has ceased to be an industrious class—it does not work for the enormous wealth which it regularly accumulates. Thus, for instance, a man purchasing a sufficient number of shares in, say, a mine, can live a life of luxurious idleness on the dividends paid off those shares, his only work being to write his signature. These dividends are provided by the labour of the miners, who, in return, are paid a small weekly sum to enable them to retain sufficient energy, by eating and sleeping, to go on working to provide more dividends. The bourgeoisie today does not even do its own administrative work, but hires its managers, overseers, officials etc; who, in Universities and other educational institutions, are elaborately trained to be good lackeys, and at the same time, acquire the bourgeois sense.

The bourgeoisie has long passed its zenith; it has become idle and decadent. At the same time the inherent contradictions of the capitalist system, daily renders the conditions of the workers more intolerable. Under stress of competition and trade depression wages are steadily reduced, unemployment grows and the worker, as he becomes hungrier, becomes more and more dissatisfied with a system which exploits his labour and allows his wife and children to die of starvation in the streets. When the workers discover that

the system of society which they maintain by their labour cannot provide them and their families with bread, they become revolutionary. It follows that, spurred on by economic necessity, the workers, ~~are~~ already well organised by their conditions of labour, will be ripe for revolution. The function of the Communist Party is that of the vanguard of the proletariat, ~~of~~ the organising, directing and disciplinary force which will guide the workers' revolution on strictly revolutionary lines towards the capture of the bourgeois State machine and its replacement by one which will function only in the interests of the workers—i.e. the establishment of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat. The situation is very clearly explained by Lenin in his book "Preparing for revolt". "Now for an insurrection something entirely different is required. What is necessary is, on the one hand, the deliberate, firm, and unshakable decision of men who have decided to fight to the very end; and, on the other hand, the silent despair of the masses *who feel the* ^{hat} henceforth half measures will not bring salvation, that it is impossible to 'influence' the Government, that the starving will 'sweep it all away, will break down everything anarchically', if the Bolsheviks do not know how to lead them in the decisive struggle." Thus successful insurrection depends on first "the deliberate, firm, and unshakable decision of men who have decided to fight to the very end,"—i.e. the Communist Party—and, on the despair and hatred of the oppressed masses who are tired of half measures". The one is the essential of the other. The vacillating, timid and reactionary Mensheviks of Russia who in 1917, were horrified by the argument of Comrade Riazonov that "the insurrection is being prepared by those who are creating despair and indifference amongst the masses." (That is the factory owners and capitalism in general) and who argued in reply that no successful movement founded on despair and indifference had ever conquered, were thus thoroughly castigated by Lenin in his "Letter to the Comrades" of October 16th-17th 1917: "the mournful hero of a sad cause replies:—'Have despair and indifference ever conquered? Oh contemptible idiots of the Novaya Zhizn! Do they know of any cases in the history of insurrection when the oppressed masses have won in a fight to the death without being reduced to despair by long sufferings and acute crises of every kind? When have the masses not been disgusted and made indifferent by the servility of free parliaments, by tramping about on the Square of the Revolution, and the manoeuvres of the Liberdans reducing the Soviets, organs of power, to the role of talk-shops? Or is it indeed a fact that the imbeciles of the Novaya-Zhizn have indeed discovered indifference among the masses on the question of the Daily Bread, on the continuance of the War, and the return of the land to the peasants?"

Thus a successful insurrection depends upon a strong, organised and disciplined Communist Party, based on the active support of the masses, whose desperate condition and hatred of their capitalist oppressors forces them to active revolution. An insurrection without this mass class support is not an insurrection in the Communist sense—it is a mere military plot foredoomed to ignominious defeat. Communism does not encourage or advocate military plots or sporadic up-risings of single groups. As usual Lenin explains this position without leaving room for doubt or misunderstanding. "A military plot is pure Blanquism, if it is not organised by the party of a determined class; if the organisers of it have not justly estimated the correct moment in general and the international situation in particular; if they have not on their side the sympathy (proved by deeds) of the majority of the people; if the course of revolution has not destroyed the illusions and the hopes of the petty bourgeoisie in the possibility and the efficacy of the method of conciliation; if the organisers of the 'plot' have not conquered the majority of the organs of revolutionary struggle recognised as 'plenipotentiary' organs, or occupying, like the Soviets, an important place in the life of the nation; if in the army (when the thing happens in War-time) there is not a determined hostility against a Government prolonging an unjust war against the will of the people; if the slogans of insurrection (such as 'All power to the Soviets,' 'The Land to the Peasants,' 'Immediate Democratic Peace towards Belligerent Nations,' 'Annulment of Secret treaties and Secret diplomacy,' etc.) if these slogans have not acquired the widest diffusion and the greatest popularity; if the advanced workers are not convinced of the desperate situation of the masses and assured of the support of the country workers (a support proved by an important peasant movement or by a wide spread insurrection against the landlords, and the government which is defrauding them); finally if the economic situation seriously allows hope in a favourable solution of the crisis, by peaceful methods and the Parliamentary way....."

Nothing could be clearer than this. If a "military plot" does not fulfil these many essential conditions, it has nothing to do with Communism; if it does fulfil these conditions then it can not be called a "military plot" but a proletarian insurrection, a revolution by the majority against the oppressing minority. It follows therefore that no Communist would take part in any conspiracy to seize the reins of power by means of a "military plot" (as insinuated in the complaint and by the Prosecution). Communists are prepared to wait for the success of the insurrection until historical development (unwelcome to the bourgeoisie but nevertheless inevitable) allows an insurrection to fulfil all the essential conditions defined,

as above, by Lenin according to the Marxist theory of economic and social development; and then this insurrection becomes a revolution of the masses led by the Communist Party for the seizure and destruction of the bourgeois State power and its replacement by the Dictatorship of the Proletariat. An insurrection which is not an insurrection of the oppressed class against the oppressing class is foreign to Communism.

Once, however, the requisite national and international conditions, are fulfilled, the Communist Party will act swiftly and with the utmost determination. For then, it is for the insurgents, in the words of Georges Sand, "either a bloody fight or extinction." For the Communists it is a fight to the last, because in case of defeat no quarter will be given by infuriated capitalism—as witness the massacres which followed the Paris Commune of 1871. Thus Lenin enumerates in a letter dated October 8th, 1917 several Marxian rules for the conduct of an armed insurrection which "like warfare is an art." He writes "Never play with insurrection and, when it is once begun, understand clearly that it must be carried through to the end....once the insurrection has begun it is necessary to act with the utmost vigour, and to wage, at all costs the *offensive*. 'The defensive is death to the insurrection'.....Marx has summarised the lessons of all revolutions or armed insurrections in the words of the greatest master of revolutionary tactics known to history, Danton: 'be daring, be still more daring: be daring always'the triumph of the Russian Revolution, as well of the world revolution, depends on two or three days' struggle". (Lenin "Preparing for Revolt" pages 254-257).

If the correct Marxist revolutionary tactics are applied, the triumph of the world revolution "depends on two or three days' struggle". Thus, ^{the}armed insurrection of the Proletariat, the seizure of the State apparatus need not necessarily be very bloody. The Russian Revolution of 1917 cost very few lives and relatively very little blood was shed—in the Revolution. The recent miscalled communal rioting at Cawnpore was more expensive in human life, than the forcible overthrow of Russian landlordism and capitalism, and the establishment of Proletarian rule over a sixth part of the world's surface. Yet the late special Public Prosecutor, Mr. Langford James, in his extraordinary opening Address made several references to the "bloodthirsty" nature of the Russian Revolution. For instance he says: "these, to me, fantastic theories of Marx were pushed to the logical conclusions with a ruthless brutality which must make everybody in the world shudder." Yet foreign eye-witnesses, journalists like John Reed, Arthur Ransome, Phillips Price and A. K. G. Williams have all emphasised that relatively

little blood was spent in the seizing and smashing of the bourgeois State power by the Russian Proletariat. It is a pity that the late special Public Prosecutor had not read "Ten days that shook the world" by John Reed or "The Russian Revolution" by A. Rhys Williams.

Later much blood was shed, it is true, and thousands and tens of thousands lost their lives, but this did not occur during the Bolsheviek insurrection and the seizure of power, nor were the Russian Bolsheviks responsible for it. These thousands of lives were lost in the terrible famine which was a result of the capitalist Allies' encirclement and blockade of Russia, and by the intervention of Great Britain, France, America and Japan, who all sent armies to try and destroy the new Proletarian power, as well as financing a whole gang of White Guardist bandit chiefs like Denikin, Kolchak, Petlura, Yudenich and others whose armies of White desperadoes committed the most horrible atrocities on the unarmed and peaceful villagers, which I shall deal with later. Thus the real murderers, assassins and bloodthirsty bandits were the capitalists of America, Japan, and in particular France and Great Britain, who kept millions of people in starvation, who refused to allow the workers' government to buy essential drugs and medicines from abroad to combat the terrible diseases which had accompanied the famine and to dress the wounds of the Red soldiers, obtained in defending the new workers' State against all the cut-throats that capitalism and Imperialism could hire. Mr. Langford James was wrong. Only the bourgeoisie "shuddered" at the Bolsheviek Revolution; because in it they read their doom; but at this wholesale murder of men, women, and children by France and Great Britain, the whole world "shuddered," and the working classes in all the Imperialist States categorically informed their capitalist rulers that this intervention in Russia had got to stop. The British, French and American troops in Russia refused to fight the Russian workers and were disbanded, while the sailors in the French Black Sea Fleet heroically mutinied and refused to serve the murderous ends of their masters. The world's public opinion was so strong that fearing revolution in their own states, the Imperialists had to call off their economic and military attack on Russia, and confine themselves to conspiring and circulating lying propaganda of which the late Mr. Langford James' speech is a glaring example.

Violence and incitement to violence.

I have shown that Communists aim at the seizure of power only when they have the mass support of a class behind them. Until the economic, national and international situation is favourable;

until the conditions of successful revolution are so ripe that the delay becomes a crime against the working class, there will be ^{no} insurrection headed by Communists. It should be remembered that when Communists talk about violence they mean organised mass violence, and not the violence of a small group as the late Mr. Langford James tried to make out. The prosecution case itself bears this out. It is admitted by the Prosecution that none of the accused in this case has committed any overt act of violence. Nor can it be said that we have incited to violence. On the other hand far from inciting the workers to insurrection we have been the means of restraining them, because conditions were not favourable for success and to save them from being butchered by Imperialism and by capitalism. Thus Comrade Mirajkar is alleged to have said at a meeting of the textile strikers in Bombay: "We cannot today do that thing, therefore we must keep peace on our side and the police who are making efforts to break peace must not be allowed to do so." The other strike speeches of my fellow accused are in similar strain. Further-more, during the February riots in Bombay of 1929, when attempts were made by Government provocateurs to implicate the leaders of the Girni Kamgar Union and the mill workers, while the petty bourgeois quarters of Bombay were a veritable shambles, the mill area under the control of the Girni Kamgar Union was the most orderly, disciplined and safest place in the whole city. We can not therefore be accused of committing any act of violence, nor can we be accused of inciting to violent insurrection, and the only thing that we can be accused of is that of frankly stating that ultimate violence will be necessary to overthrow the bourgeois State power, which can only be done when the masses are ready to do it.

How shall we obtain arms to capture the State ?

Sceptics are in the habit of reasoning thus: "You admit that the State is the monopoly of organised violence, and therefore how can the workers who are without arms and ammunition, seize the State by violence, smash it and set up their own State ?"

The Committing Magistrate also passingly refers to this scepticism when he writes in his Order, "it is put forward that this is a misconception and that it is quite absurd to talk of armed revolution particularly in India where the Arms Act is strictly in force". We can have a certain amused sympathy with these sceptics, who in their fundamental ignorance ^{bill} themselves into a false security under the protecting shadow of the Indian Arms Act. Their argument is manifestly absurd: How did the Russian workers get their arms with which they captured the State? How did the Communist workers of Paris get their arms with which they defended Paris

against the blood-thirsty cut-throats of ~~Theirs~~ and of the French bourgeoisie? How did every revolutionary movement in history provide itself with arms in spite of the laws of their oppressors? If these sceptics had the intelligence to ask themselves these questions, all their doubts and false security would once and for all be removed. But like the traditional ostrich they prefer to keep their heads buried in the sand.

When historical development makes a revolution necessary arms have never been wanting. So it will be with the revolutionary Proletariat.

The chief forces of the State consist of the Army, the Navy and the Police. Now all these three forces are recruited from the workers and in some countries, for example India, from the peasantry. The soldiers and the sailors coming from the working class still retain their class sense and sympathies in spite of their systematic brutalisation by the bourgeoisie. A soldier has the instinct of his class: his father may be an unemployed miner, his brothers may be strikers. If he is a peasant, he knows the difficulties of his family to find sufficient food to eat. If he marries he marries in his own class, a daughter of a workman or of a peasant. This being so no amount of iron discipline can destroy his class sympathies and instincts. Therefore when troops are used against the workers in industrial countries or against the peasants in backward countries, it is only natural that many of them will refuse to fire on their own brothers, fathers, on their own class. Bourgeois governments know this well and are very chary about using troops against the workers. Examples are not wanting: in the French Revolution the troops brought up to Paris by Louis XVI to shoot down the rank and file revolutionaries, rather than do so turned their fire on their officers and joined the revolutionaries with their arms and equipment. It is also interesting to note that the only troops which remained loyal to Louis and the aristocracy were foreign mercenaries—the Swiss Guards. In Germany after the War, German soldiers and sailors allied with the workers and formed Councils, which were the nuclei of the German Revolution. In Russia the same thing happened on a large scale. In the Bolshevik Revolution of November 1917 practically the whole army, with the exception of one or two Caucasian "savage" divisions and the Cossacks who belonged to the middle and wealthy peasantry, were with the Bolsheviks. So much so that the Winter Palace in Petrograd, now (Leningrad), had to be defended on behalf of the bourgeoisie by a specially recruited regiment of women.

Even the Cossacks, whom Lenin describes as follows: "As regards the Cossacks, we are dealing with a portion of the population

that is composed of small, medium and big landed proprietors who have preserved the economic and moral characteristics of the Middle Ages,"—even the Cossacks, the former instrument of Czarist terrorism, later in February 1920 declared themselves on the side of the Soviets. "Discontent, indignation and exasperation continued to grow in the Army and among the peasants and workers," wrote Lenin before the Proletarian revolution, and as this discontent became revolutionary Lenin correctly exhorted the Soviets as follows:— "If the Soviets seize power now in order to carry out the programme expounded above, they can be certain not only of the support of the working-class and the great majority of peasants, but also of the revolutionary enthusiasm of the Army and of the majority of the people; without which enthusiasm victory over famine and War is impossible." (Preparing for Revolt, page 80.)

That this "revolutionary enthusiasm of the army" of which Lenin spoke was justified is shown by the fact that, at the time of writing one soldier converted to Bolshevik views led the Finnish Regiment and the Moscow Regiment, a force of 35000 soldiers, to surround the Town Hall where the Provisional Government of Kerensky was besieged in order to arrest that Government. Then there are the exploits of the sailors of the Russian Navy at Kronstadt, whom Trotsky referred to as, "the flower of the revolutionary forces." "Even in India, we saw last year that a body of Indian soldiers of the Garhwal Rifles refused to fire when ordered to do so at Peshawar on demonstrators of their own class.

So has it been in the past and so will it be in the future. Civil War is the most acute form of class-struggle, and in that war the best elements of those forces of the present state who are recruited from the oppressed class will go to the active support of their class—together with their arms and equipment.

Naturally the bourgeoisie is not going to be deprived of all its forces. Wealth will still be on their side, and with money they will hire expensive mercenaries recruited from the "Lumpen Proletariat", Goondas, the petty bourgeoisie and those few soldiers who in their ignorance will be prepared to sell their birth-right for a few extra shillings. Of such elements was the Irish Auxiliary Force (Black and Tans) recruited, who for amazingly high wages did the dirty terroristic work of Imperialism in Ireland, work which the regular troops could not be trusted to carry out. These forces of reaction, however, will be dispersed like chaff before the wind of the victorious Proletarian Revolution.

If the proletarian insurrection takes place in the midst of an Imperialist War—as in Russia—and which is likely, the task of

of arming the workers is greatly facilitated because the bourgeoisie will do so themselves. In time of War the bourgeoisie is compelled to place rifles, ammunition, guns and bombs in the hands of its class-enemy—the Proletariat. It is a very simple matter for the workers, when the revolution breaks out, to refrain from using these arms against foreign workers, and to turn them against their class enemy, the bourgeoisie. The capturing of arsenals, depots of ammunition and military equipment forms part of the insurrection itself.

So our sceptics need labour under no illusion, nor should they base their hopes on the Arms Act. When the time is ripe, the working-class will have arms enough, and at the same time a good part of the bourgeois State forces will join the workers. For the bourgeois the prospect is not pleasant, but blindness will not help him.

Red Terror.

Once the insurrection has been successful and the Proletariat has smashed the bourgeois state and replaced it with the Dictatorship of the Proletariat, it becomes necessary for this Dictatorship to adopt ruthless and energetic measures against all those counter-revolutionary elements who will organise with the active financial and military help of outside capitalism, to overthrow the new workers' State by means of active warfare, conspiracy to sabotage etc. For the safety of the Revolution, for the welfare of the masses and for the ultimate establishment of Communism it is imperative for the Proletarian State to replace these counter-revolutionary activities with the sternest and most uncompromising means. The seizure of power and the destruction of the bourgeois state machinery is an easy task compared to the difficulties and dangers of maintaining the power thus won. The successful proletarian insurrection occurs when capitalism is least able to cope with it. But after the success of the insurrection, national capitalism has plenty of time at its disposal to recuperate its forces by conspiring with foreign capitalism to undermine and overthrow by force the workers' State. Unless the latter combats these activities with its utmost force and energy, it is not doing its duty to the World Revolution of the Proletariat. The measures adopted by the Dictatorship of the Proletariat to destroy counter-revolution are known among our opponents as the "Red Terror".

Let us refer again to the opening address of the late Mr. Langford James, which is a classical example of Imperialist propaganda against Communism. On page 6 of the 2nd edition he says: "Now, your Honour, a large number of people, when

you mention Russia, connect it with bloodshed and a ruthless reign of terror and with the Cheka (now, I understand, known as OGPU)." Then on page 19 we find the following amazing remarks: "..... Now of course we cannot come to that conclusion without thinking that this is the chimaera for which some two and a half millions of men, women and children have been butchered by the OGPU at the dictation of these doctrinaire desperadoes." I wonder from ~~wonder~~ from where the late Mr. Langford James got his figures—out of his own head or from Riga. If 2½ millions of men, women and children had been slaughtered in Russia, then any impartial History will assure you that they were slaughtered by Imperialist blockades, by armies of White Guard bandits, by the pious interventionists of Great Britain and France, and the people responsible for this wholesale slaughter are those fat and greasy capitalists whom the late Mr. Langford James so ably defended.

The Cheka.

Yet it is perfectly true that there existed an extraordinary Commission for Combatting Counter-Revolution, usually known as the Cheka (which is not the same thing as the OGPU) which in the course of its duties has had to shoot a good number of those agents of the Russian and foreign bourgeoisie who were actively conspiring to overthrow the Workers' State, deluge Moscow and Leningrad with the blood of revolutionaries and workers as they had done previously in 1905, and replace the Red Terror by the infinitely more dreadful White Terror.

The Cheka functioned chiefly during those years when Russia was invaded on every side by White Guards and foreign troops, when Russia was full of spies and agents of the Imperialist powers, when world capitalism had organised all its forces and was trying to crush the Russian workers by fraud and armed violence. On September 5th 1918 there was an attempted assassination of Lenin, as he was leaving a workmen's meeting in Moscow, by Social Revolutionaries. On the same day Right Social Revolutionary agents assassinated two commissars of the Petrograd Soviet, the well-known Communists, Urilsky and Volodarsky. Fires also broke out in the petroleum tanks (the last fuel store for the winter) on the outskirts of Moscow. The external position was even more terrible. In the East was the Czarist Admiral Kolchak with troops equipped by the British and French. In the West were the invading White armies of Finland, Lithuania and the Letts, in the North at Archangel were the British, French and American armies and their General, Sir Edmond Ironside, who, by the way, formerly presided in this

present bungalow where we are being tried. In the south were the Death battalions of Denikin supported by the British and French Fleet; from Esthonia General Yudenich was marching on Leningrad; in Poland and the Ukraine ^{and} was Petlura and in Crimea was Wrangel and his Cossack cavalry. Besides all this military encirclement of Russia organised and systematic attempts were made to paralyse the internal working of the Soviet State by sabotage, treachery, corruption, bribery and by wholesale espionage. This was the most critical period of the Proletarian Revolution in Russia.

Half measures, or no measures at all as advocated by Kautsky, would not only have been fatal in meeting this tremendous capitalist offensive, but would have been tantamount to complete capitulation to Imperialism and treachery to the world's Proletariat. In his book "My reminiscences of the Russian Revolution" by M. Phillips Price, the special correspondent of the Liberal 'Manchester Guardian,' writes on this subject: "And this, in fact, was one of the reasons which the Communists gave for the Red Terror. Conspirators could only be convinced that the Soviet Republic was powerful enough to be respected, if it was able to punish its enemies. But nothing would convince those enemies except the fear of death, because all were persuaded that the Soviet Republic was falling. Given these circumstances, it is difficult to say what weapon the Communists could have used to get their will respected. All the restraints of so-called civilisation had been swept aside, and both Reds and Whites were in the throes of a struggle in which physical force was the deciding factor.... For if one side had used force, and the other side had relied only on moral strength, the latter's ideas would have remained for ever but pious phrases, while the former's alone would have been engraved on the scrolls of history for later generations to read, mark and learn." (M. Phillips Price. "My Reminiscences of the Russian Revolution" pp. 335-336). The Bolsheviks realised this, and were determined not to repeat the mistakes of the Paris Commune of 1871. They realised that it was not sufficient simply to capture the bourgeois State machine, it had to be shattered, broken up, blown up and exploded. The Paris Commune failed to do this, and furthermore were carried away by misguided humanitarianism and tenderness towards their class enemy—which was rewarded by the wholesale massacre of the Communards by the troops of ~~Thiers~~ ^{Thiers} commanded by a Souteneur named Gallifet. For failing to adopt the most vigorous methods against their class opponents the Commune was censured by Marx, who at the same time praised their heroism in "storming Heaven".

Lenin explains this point clearly in "State and Revolution".

(page 55): "It is still necessary to suppress the capitalist class and crush its resistance. This was particularly necessary for the Commune, and one of the reasons of its defeat was that it did not do this with sufficient determination".

As I have said, the Bolsheviks did not lack in determination, nor did they display any fatal weakness in repressing the counter-revolutionary activities of the bourgeoisie. The bourgeois State having been smashed, the organ of this repression was the Workers' State, the Dictatorship of the Proletariat. Yet there is a fundamental difference between bourgeois repression and Proletarian repression. Lenin expresses this clearly: "but the organ of suppression is now the majority of the population, and not a minority, as was always the case under slavery, serfdom and wage labour. And once the majority of the nation itself suppresses its oppressors, a 'special' force for suppression is no longer necessary". Thus the repression of the bourgeoisie in Russia is done not by special higher force, but by the majority of the population, who are naturally interested to see that their oppressors do not succeed in getting back by treacherous intrigues etc.

The Cheka was the executive organ of the popular will in combatting counter-revolution. It was an extraordinary organ for extraordinary times. To some extent its functions were similar to those of the Committee of the Public Safety of the French Revolution, with the sole difference that the Cheka did not waste time by staging judicial farces (which appeal so much to the bourgeoisie and particularly to the Indian Government). It had to deal swiftly and shortly with a situation which threatened to swallow up the Workers' State of Russia. Its decisions were reached only after a thorough enquiry but there was no appeal. If a man was proved to have conspired against the workers, and was a danger to the freedom of the majority, if a man was conspiring to open the sluices of Russia to the countless hordes of Imperialist White Guards waiting to drown the revolution in blood, if a man by sabotage and counter-revolutionary activity or spying was stabbing the Red Army of the workers in the back and jeopardising their heroic fight against the forces of Imperialism, the Cheka quietly and cleanly shot him.

In this way a few useless lives were taken to protect the lives of millions. These precautions to protect the State in time of crisis are not new. Every bourgeois State adopts similar measures in time of crises, particularly wars, and if anybody says that the numerous spies shot in Great Britain and France during the War, were treated any differently, if indeed as well, as Russian traitors, British and French spies were treated by the Cheka, I say that they

are either phenomenally stupid or colossal liars. Bourgeois countries in times of crises introduce Martial Law. The Cheka was the Court Martial of the Russian revolutionary Proletariat. Its moderation, however, is shown by the following quotation from the above mentioned book of Phillips Price: "Nevertheless, the few thousand lives sacrificed during the worst period of the Red Terror did not amount to a fraction of those millions sacrificed by the Imperialists in the European War." (Page 337). According to figures published in the *Izvestia* in March 1920, only 9641 persons were executed in the course of 1919 by order of the Commission, and just over 6000 during the last four months of 1919. After the defeat of Denikin and Kolchak Martial law and the death sentence were abolished until the renewed allied offensive through Poland of May 1920 rendered extraordinary measures once again necessary. Then between June the 15th and July the 15th, 893 persons were executed according to the Report of the Supreme Revolutionary Tribunal. It is unnecessary for me to emphasise that the Cheka's activities were never directed against the workers and the masses: they were only directed against spies, traitors and counter-revolutionaries. Its activities were not only necessary but worthy of the highest praise.

Today the Cheka does not exist its place has been taken by the OGPU, a sort of political police, whose function is to foil counter-revolutionary intrigues and produce the offenders before the Revolutionary Tribunal for trial. The Revolutionary Tribunal is a court actuated in defending the interests of the working class, and does not attempt to disguise its class nature by nauseating and blatantly hypocritical disguises adopted by the bourgeois class with its empty prattle of judicial impartiality. For in Russia today the utmost vigour and vigilance must be observed to combat revolutionary activity as the recent Ramzin Trial in this year, the attempted plotting of Russian saboteurs, with French and British Imperialism, has proved. Yet the need for the Cheka has passed with the most critical period of the Revolution, and its place has been taken by the much milder body of the OGPU.

White Terror.

I have said previously that it was the habit of the Russian workers to shoot, quickly and cleanly, all those found guilty of heinous crimes against the revolution at its most critical period, and this was known as the Red Terror.

But the Red Terror is by no means the only Terror—there is the infinitely more ferocious White Terror which has not got the same justification as it consists of the terrorisation of the majority

by the minority, instead of the minority by the majority, for the inglorious object of upholding the oppression of capitalism and Imperialism.

The White Terror is the manifestation of capitalism, panic-stricken and desperate, with its back against the wall. It is a manifestation of capitalism on its last legs abandoning its hypocritical covering and snarling and fighting for sheer existence. The bourgeoisie while still powerful likes to rule by deception and fraud—it is safer, easier and less expensive. Overthrowing feudalism by means of popular slogans of rule by a popularly elective Parliament, the so-called bourgeois Democracy, it sees that the Democratic machine functions only in the interests of the ruling class, that is the bourgeoisie.

Once, however, the bourgeois democratic machine fails to function properly in the interests of the bourgeoisie, then it is the bourgeoisie itself which destroys that democratic machine, and rules by means of a virulent terrorism. This is only done in cases of extreme necessity, because the bourgeoisie much prefers to rule by fraud than by open terror. When, however, their "democratic" organisation no longer deceives the people, who have lost all faith in it and see it in its bourgeois nakedness, when, in consequence the people are preparing to take things into their own hands, this "democratic" organisation is scrapped and ruthless Terror is instituted. This is termed "White Terror," and any one who has seen the White Terror in action can testify to its unparalleled atrocity. In Europe the White Terror is at present raging at its worst in Italy, Roumania, Bulgaria, Yugo Slavia, and Baltic States; in a more veiled form in Germany, Austria, and Czecho-Slovakia. In some countries, where the bourgeoisie although rapidly declining, is still strong and fairly sure of itself, as in England, U. S. A. and France, the bourgeois "democratic" machine still continues to function and cover up the most atrocious crimes against the people. Occasionally in these latter democratic countries, we get a glimpse of the terror which the bourgeoisie is preparing for us all.

D/- 20-7-31

In Asia, White Terror is rampant in China, where squads of White executioners parade the streets and brutally behead on the spot anybody who they think looks like a Communist—but, then, China not having yet reached that standard of refined brutality and pious hypocrisy which distinguishes Western civilisation, does its butcher's work much more crudely if less callously. Japan is not backward in terrorising the Japanese workers and peasants, the massacre of the Javanese by Dutch Imperialism in 1926-27, and all the other atrocities perpetrated by Imperialism in the East, fade into

Comparative insignificance when compared with the systematic terrorising of 350 million people by a handful of agents of British Imperialism in India. I shall have more to say about this later.

In Italy, the White Terror takes the form of Fascism. Before the War, Italy was ruled by the vested interests of Southern Italy, which were chiefly landholding, and the Italian "democratic" machine never functioned as efficiently as in other countries. The rapid rise in heavy industry however, in Northern Italy during the War and after the dispossession of the Austrians, the general unrest and dissatisfaction among the workers and peasants of Italy, and the rapid increase in the members of the Radical Socialist Party (there was no Communist Party as such—the Socialist Party then contained elements of the Left and the Right); in short, the revolutionary tendency of the Italian masses, necessitated some more efficient Government. Hence Mussolini and the Fascists. The Fascists was originally an ex-servicemen's Association founded and led by a renegade Socialist, one Benito Mussolini, who had been expelled from the Socialist Party for advocating Italy's participation in the War. With the rapidly developing discontent among Italian workers, and the increasing success of the Left Socialists together with the futile manoeuvres of the semi-landlord Government, the Association and its leaders become the hirelings of the northern industrialist party. Generously financed by heavy industry Mussolini in 1922, uttering popular slogans to keep the workers quiet, staged his comic-operatic march on Rome, the dramatic effect of which was spoiled by Mussolini previously accepting the King's invitation to form a Government. Having thus seized the reins of power Mussolini lost no time in doing the dirty work of his industrialist masters. Gangs of assassins, armed to the teeth and wearing black-shirts so as not to show the dirt, paraded the streets of all the main towns, murdering, ravishing and burning with the object of introducing in the Italian people, particularly the workers, a proper respect for "orderly" government and heavy industry. These mass assassinations of workers were openly encouraged by Mussolini and his Camarilla and the whole of Italy was left at the mercy of these bands of murderers until all opposition had been slaughtered or cowed down. Those who go to Italy today can testify to the arrogance, insolence, brutality and omnipotence shown by every miserable whipper-snapper of a petty bourgeois who dons a black shirt.

Mussolini had not long been in power before he announced a new electoral law. Finding that the murder of his leading opponents like Matteotti—about which he openly gloats in his autobiography—was too troublesome, he got rid of all opposition by decreeing that only Fascists and those others of whom the Government

approved should be elected to Parliament—so that from being completely ignored Parliament was promoted to be the megaphone of the dictator. The ordinary law-courts were replaced by Fascist Tribunals, and Lipari and other islands off the Italian coast were quickly converted into vast prisons for all those who were courageous enough to differ from Fascism. To these islands were sent Italian Liberals and Constitutionalists, Doctors, Professors and the like—so much so that even bourgeois newspapers have devoted much space to denouncing Mussolini's ways of dealing with intellectuals whose only crime is having criticised Fascism. The usual punishment for even the slightest offences is 20 years' imprisonment, and on these islands the prisoners rot under the filthiest conditions. The islands, however, bad as they are, are usually considered too good for Communists and rebellious workmen. These are taken to secret Fascist dungeons, where they are almost invariably tortured to death. The favourite torture of these blackguards is Mussolini's famous "Castor-Oil Cure for Communism" which consists of forcing gallons of castor-oil down a man's throat until he dies in agony. In this way thousands have been secretly murdered in Fascist dens by these crapulous black-shirted tools of a dying system.

In Poland the people have the honour of being tortured, throttled and emasculated by a certain Marshal Pilsudski whose face alone would ensure a conviction for murder. This notorious Spadassin, whose actions daily proclaim him to be a homicidal lunatic, is the agent of the Polish bourgeoisie and of its British, French and American backers, and ruler of Poland. I remember that in 1927, I translated a book by a French Journalist—who was anything but a Communist—who described his experiences and observations in Poland. His description of the atrocities committed on individuals by the Pilsudskian Police gave me—who am not very squeamish—a distinct sense of nausea. Tearing off toe-nails, driving match stalks between the finger nail and the finger or, alternatively, tearing off the finger nails altogether, grinding sound teeth to the root one by one with an electric drill, emasculation, and other personal atrocities of such an obscene nature that it is better left to the imagination. I may mention another form of Police "persuasion" which is to force a man to drink large quantities of ammonia through a cloth until finally he is suffocated.

But for more recent examples of this Polish White Terror—which is typical of all White Terror—it is only necessary to refer to the press reports of the Polish "pacification of Ukraine" and the Polish Elections which took place during the concluding months of 1930. Last October, November and December the British Liberal bourgeois press carried on a systematic exposure of the atrocities that were committed in Poland by Pilsudski to

insure a Government majority at the Elections. Troops were sent to pacify the Polish Ukraine, and to induce them to vote for Pilsudski, which they did by indiscriminately beating, generally to death, of the Ukrainian peasants, men, women and children who crossed their path. Thus the London "Observer" of November 23rd, 1930 writes under the heading "the Polish Farce" (Tragedy would have been a better word): "... his originality (Pilsudski's) is that he uses dictatorial power but wants to cover it in a constitutional veneer... Logically and grimly he has again tried his luck at the polls. By dint of arresting opponents, bribing waverers, cowing the Ukrainians by a process of pacification involving the physical chastisement and even assassination of peasants, he emerges as the people's chosen." The special correspondent of the Manchester Guardian, writing from Lemberg on 21st November 1930, describes the usual procedure of Pilsudskian "pacification" and "electioneering": "eleven Ukrainian peasants most horribly beaten by the Poles are lying here in a primitive Ukrainian hospital. They are only a few of the many victims of what is officially known as the 'pacification of Eastern Galicia.' It is necessary to be quite frank in dealing with what is one of the most appalling atrocities of modern times. These eleven peasants were so beaten on the bare buttocks that the flesh was literally pulped.... I asked the kindly priests who were looking after the beaten victims to let me see the actual injuries. Thereupon bandages and pads of cotton wool were removed and the bluish tint of living flesh beaten to pulp three, four or five weeks ago was exposed to my sight. Photographs of the injuries are in my possession." When the man, woman or child is the process of being beaten into pulp and faints he or she is revived by buckets of cold water and the process goes on. In this way hundreds have been killed and thousands maimed for life. Finally, the Manchester Guardian Correspondent writes: "I may add that in some villages where the peasants were beaten they were told that if they did not vote for Marshal Pilsudski on Sunday, there would be a second 'pacification.'" This is how your bourgeois Democracy functions, as a camouflage for the inhuman ferocity of the White Terror. For Imperialism and capitalism such terrorism is necessary in Poland which, being a buffer State between Soviet Russia and the big Capitalist States of Europe, is the basis of Imperialist anti-Soviet attacks, as well as being a stopper for the Communist atmosphere and influence penetrating further West.

One more quotation. This time from a report by Miss Mary Sheepshanks, Secretary of the Women's International League at Geneva, published in the Manchester Guardian on the 2nd of January of this year. She describes the horrible atrocities inflicted by the Poles on Ukrainian men, women and children and

concludes as follows: "Several points must be emphasised: that this so-called pacification has been carried out with a ferocity which can only be compared to the previous atrocities carried out in the early nineteenth century by the Bashi-bazouks in the old Turkish territories, and secondly that these atrocities were not punishment inflicted for crimes but were inflicted without trial and wholesale on an entire population. Thirdly, that they were done by command of the Government and were carried out strictly according to plan and were not merely the excesses of subordinates. Fourthly, that the victims were denied all medical assistance etc...." That should be enough.

I have described the White Terror in Poland in some detail because it is typical of the same phenomenon in all specified countries above, particularly in the Baltic States of Latvia, Lithuania, and Finland which are merely kept as naval and military bases of British and French Imperialism, to be directed when necessary against the Soviet Republic. An interesting sidelight on the nature of the Baltic States in general was shown in the recent Presidential Elections in Finland, during March of this year. In these Elections the Prime Minister of Finland Mr. Svinhufoud was elected and defeated his rival Dr. Slahlberg. Mr. Svinhufoud is the head of the so-called anti-Communist Coalition Government, and was responsible for the anti-Communist laws passed by the Diet in the previous November. Dr. Slahlberg was defeated because, although he approved of these anti-Communist laws, he "deprecated the excess of the anti-Communist movement in Finland." (Manchester Guardian 20/2/31) Latvia has an additional distinction of having as its capital Riga, the place from where all the false news concerning Russia is disseminated and where all the anti-Russian forgeries of the type of the Zinoviev Letter are manufactured.

Two other small States which have made their names stink in the nostrils of all decent men by the unprecedented atrocities of their White Terror, are Bulgaria and Roumania.

Bulgaria suppressed the agrarian revolt of 1921 with unprecedented violence. Men, women and children were butchered in the streets and their bodies left to rot there, so that one English journalist wrote "dogs were roaming about the streets, carrying in their mouths pieces of bleeding human flesh." Even the reactionary peasants' leader Stambulisky, who had been Prime Minister, was butchered by the assassins of Tsanke and Co., his body being cut into thousands of minute pieces. Workers and peasants, and particularly Communists were massacred, some openly in the

streets and fields, others in the prisons, Army officers amused themselves by trailing along the road living men attached by rope to highly powered motor-cars. Women and young girls were raped by the soldiery, who afterwards ripped open their stomachs with bayonets. More recently in 1926 a bomb was thrown in the Cathedral at Sofia, during a ceremony, killing a few unnecessary Generals. The Bulgarian Whites immediately declared that the Communists were responsible for this—although it is well known that Communism is opposed to such futile outrages—and a systematic massacre of all Communists was planned and carried out indiscriminately on every worker or Communist they could lay their hands on. The Liberal bourgeois press—particularly the Manchester Guardian—was once again horrified at these atrocities, as anyone can see for themselves by consulting the files of the first few months of 1927. When, however, all the Communists who could be caught had been slaughtered by the Whites, the Government suddenly discovered that the real perpetrators of the Cathedral outrage were Yugo-Slavian nationals, and a systematic murder of Yugo-Slavians was started. In this way the Bulgarian Government killed two birds with one stone: firstly they killed off the leading revolutionaries and secondly they killed off the leaders of the Serbian minority which was causing them some trouble, by wanting to become Yugo-Slavian nationals.

Similar events have happened in Rumania, whose forcible annexation of Russian Bessarabia during the Allied intervention, was one of the most bare faced acts of political piracy in history. As the Bessarabians were unwilling to become Rumanians, troops were sent and White Terror took possession of the land. This terrorising of the population of Bessarabia by Rumanian White Guards has been going on for ten years and is still continuing today, although certain large sections of the population have been decimated. The Rumanian Government's methods of dealing with Communists and revolutionary workers are identical with those of their brother assassins in Bulgaria.

There are countries which having already suffered from periods of acute bourgeois terrorism, are now ruled by a moderated form of the same thing. Such countries are Germany, Austria and Czecho-Slovakia.

The best example of this is Germany. After and during the Spartacist insurrection in Berlin 1919, and the later collapse of the Central German Revolution, the German bourgeoisie partially recovered with Allied help from the effects of the War, decided to repress the working class with all the force at its command. The continual massacre of the workers of Germany was done by the

Social-Democratic Government of Schiedemann, and Noske. Noske admitted his responsibility when he announced himself as the "bloodhound" in the Reichstag. Individual assassinations of an appalling nature distinguished the German White Terror, as well as wholesale massacres, witness the murder of Rosa Luxembourg and Karl Liebnrecht who had led the Spartacist revolt. Both were prisoners in the Eden Hotel in Berlin. One evening Karl Liebnrecht was led out of the Hotel and at the portal he was clubbed into insensibility by the rifle butts of officers and their hirelings. In this state he was taken to the Tiergarten and shot dead in the back. Then it was publicly announced that Karl Liebnrecht had been killed "while attempting to escape." This excuse for cold, calculated murder is a very common one with the Central and Eastern European bourgeoisie, and is so delightfully simple that I have no doubt it will speedily appeal to the imagination of the Governments of Great Britain and India.

Similarly Rosa Luxembourg was led out of the Hotel and a White Guard thereupon smashed her skull like an egg with his rifle butt, and her body was thrown into the river Spree. The murders of Karl Liebnrecht and Rosa Luxembourg are only two prominent examples of the wholesale assassinations carried out by the German bourgeois and the German Terrorists.

In Central Germany this was done even more brutally. Workers' leaders were rounded up, crammed into a small cell and then volleys fired into the heap who were afterwards finished off with bayonets. I do not wish to dwell on these atrocities. Those people who have read their newspapers intelligently already know about them.

Today, the German bourgeoisie has stabilised itself with the aid of American Dollars, and Allied concessions (of which the recent Hoover Moratorium for preventing Revolution is an example) and tries to rule with an appearance of 'Democracy'. Yet beneath this thin, very thin, veneer of constitutionalism, White Terror stalks unchecked through the workers' quarters. The German Police are always armed to the teeth and use their arms on the slightest pretext. Every workers' meeting is surrounded with Police equipped with hand grenades, revolvers, machine-guns and rifles. In 1923 a workers' meeting was held at the industrial centre of Halle. The Police entered the hall, looked all the doors and fired on the audience killing and wounding. And this is not an isolated instance—many such have occurred. Peaceful workers' processions are charged by the Police without provocation, and when they are tired of using the rubber batons, as often as not they use their revolvers.

The same situation exists in Austria. You will remember that it reached a crisis when the workers of Vienna, horrified at the callous behaviour of the Austrian Courts in acquitting a Fascist who had even admitted his guilt in murdering Communist men and women, rose in July 1927, and as a protest burnt the Law Courts. This spontaneous rising was suppressed with the same ferocity as the bourgeoisie always shows when in a panic.

Both in Austria and Germany there are strong Fascist parties,—the Heimwehr and the miscalled National Socialist Party (the Nazis) of Hitler. These Fascists particularly the followers of Hitler are responsible for many political murders chiefly of Communists. Hitler's Party is financed by German heavy industrialists, prominent among whom is the notorious Herr Hugenburg, and is a reserve force of the bourgeoisie. It has not, of course, had full scope for its terroristic ability as yet. It has had to confine its activities to attempts to break up workers' meetings and processions, and to individual assassinations. We have recently read of the assassination in March of this year of Comrade Henning, a Communist member of the Hamburg Council, by Hitlerite Fascists who shot him in cold blood when he was returning home in a bus. Very soon when the already dis-satisfied workers of Germany actively threaten bourgeois supremacy the Nazis with their volunteer organisation the Stahlhelm (Steel Helmets) will be given carte blanche to murder, massacre, ravish and burn.

The United States of America is a peculiar country. It is, of course, a bourgeois democracy, and today it is the wealthiest and most successful bourgeois country in the world. Yet in spite of its immense wealth and prestige the American bourgeoisie is not happy. The immense wealth of America compared with the poverty of other bourgeois states, has brought a slump on the American market, which together with over-production has presented the American bourgeoisie with five millions unemployed. This together with a constant influx of emigrants, many of them bringing advanced views from Europe, constitutes a dangerous problem for the American bourgeoisie. Then again the American bourgeoisie is not as subtle or as tricky as the European. Its rapid rise to prosperity and success has not given it time to develop that refined, hypocritical tyranny which so distinguishes the British ruling class. Its methods of repression are crude and openly terroristic, when such methods are unnecessary and positively harmful to the bourgeoisie itself. Not taking the trouble to cover up its crimes, the American 'Democracy' has become a by-word of Police Terrorism, Gang Raj, and Chicagoism, frame-ups and brutal strike breaking. The frame-up is a very popular weapon of the American hundred per cent bourgeois, although he does not possess the same talent in this as

the Indian Government with its conspiracy and sedition cases. There is the case of the two Labour leaders, Mooney, and Billings, who were sentenced for life in 1916 for having thrown a bomb, which as is now proved was in reality thrown by Police provocateurs. In spite of the fact that the main Prosecution witnesses have confessed to perjury a re-trial has been refused. Mooney and Billings, two innocent men are still in prison.

Then there is the terrible case of Sacco and Vanzetti who were judicially murdered in August 1927, after being under sentence of death for six years, for a murder which another man had confessed to. These two Italians were anarchists, they were proved innocent, their trial was a farce, and Judge Thayer who tried the original trial as well as the re-trial, was a miserable scoundrel whose name will be recorded in History in the same category as that of Judge Jeffreys. In spite of the protests of millions of workers all over the world Sacco and Vanzetti were murdered by the American bourgeoisie in spite of their manifest innocence. Even more recently 16 workers who had taken a prominent part in a strike at Gastonia, Texas, were arrested and tried for the murder of a Police Officer. The only evidence against these men was that they were strike leaders: there was no evidence that any one of them had murdered or incited to murder the Police Chief. Nevertheless, most of them were condemned to life imprisonment. As a capitalist frame-up it is on a par with the notorious Meerut Conspiracy Case in India. Many other such incidents could be given but I think I have already given sufficient.

Apart from judicial frame-ups, the American Police carry on a systematic campaign of terrorism against the American workers. Peaceful demonstrations are broken up with batons, tear-gas and bullets. Meetings are dispersed, and leaders subjected to the notorious Third Degree in sound-proof rooms. A worker recently died in New York, because he had been beaten with a rubber baton on the larynx. Not satisfied with the terroristic capabilities of the Police, the American bourgeoisie forms Fascist Associations like the American Legion, and an amended form of the Klu Klux Klan (this time directed not against negroes, but against workers both black and white) who are periodically let loose against strikers, Labour leaders, Left Socialists and particularly Communists. The record of these associations is a record of murder, rapine and arson.

The bourgeoisie of Great Britain has made hypocrisy into a fine art. One of the oldest bourgeois states, founded on traditional slogans of "Parliamentary rule" "Judicial Impartiality"

"Freedom of Speech and Opinions etc" it has known how to make use of these to cover up the tyranny and iniquities of its rule. It is true that generally Great Britain has more apparent freedom than most other countries, that usually people are not arrested for sedition when they criticise the Government and that the workers are legally allowed to organise themselves without getting run in for conspiracy. Yet whenever the bourgeoisie is menaced all these traditional liberties disappear as if by magic.

Thus during the War there was conscription for the first time in the history of Britain. Secondly there was the Defence of the Realm Act, which while giving the Govt: dictatorial powers, took away all rights from the citizens. This was done to protect bourgeois interests from foreign aggression, but when the bourgeoisie was menaced by the Workers' General Strike in 1926, it promulgated the Emergency Powers Act depriving the citizens once again of all their so-called legal rights. Hence a British citizen has rights only as long as the bourgeoisie wish him to think he has some. When those rights are obnoxious to the ruling class, they are calmly abrogated with a stroke of the pen.

During the General Strike the British bourgeoisie had to resort to open terrorism. Military demonstrations of troops with fixed bayonets, tanks, guns etc. were staged in the working class quarters: hundreds of peaceful workers had their heads broken by police batons etc. Leaders were thrown into jail on charges of sedition; and, although the Government had its 'propaganda news-sheets' "the British Gazette", edited by Winston Churchill all workers' news-sheets were proscribed. During the General Strike the workers of Britain had their first real taste of White Terror.

Yet the British bourgeoisie, while rapidly declining, is still strong. It has as yet no need to institute a continuous Terror. At the same time, however, it is preparing to do so. All students of politics are aware of the growing trend in England towards a dictatorship—towards a British variety of Fascism. The Manifesto issued by Sir Oswald Mosley a few months ago, advocating an Emergency Cabinet of five, with special powers, the activities and speeches of Winston Churchill, the manoeuvres of Sir William Morris and the Federated British Industries are all very significant. The British bourgeoisie is conscious that soon it will no longer be able to rule by fraud and hypocrisy. It is preparing to rule by the terrorising of its class enemy.

It is unnecessary to go into further detail. It can be seen that the so-called Red Terror is only a temporary measure to protect the lives and welfare of the majority. It quickly and

humanely shoots its enemies, whereas White Terror inhumanly and obscenely tortures its countless victims by means which even mediaeval torturers were ignorant of, and its terror is directed against the majority for the protection of a minority of oppressors.

The renegade, Kautsky, objected to the Bolsheviks resorting to terrorism, saying that they should adopt "peaceful persuasion." He was thoroughly castigated by Trotsky in his "Defence of Terrorism", who observed that "the White Guards find it easier to hang a Communist worker than to convert him with a book of Kautsky." Such action can only be met with similar action—White Terror in Russia could only be counteracted by Red Terror.

White Terror in India.

But before leaving this subject I would like to say a few words about White Terror in India and Burma.

India is ruled by the same oligarchy which oppresses the workers of Britain. But this oligarchy employs methods in India, which it does not dare to employ as yet in Britain. For British Imperialism terrorism is a political necessity in India, a subject country whose teeming millions are exploited by a handful of Imperialist sharks. A single spark in India may cause a conflagration which might well be the end of Imperialism altogether. In consequence British Imperialism in India can not only rely on fraud and deception—although it makes very good use of this weapon—it must also use the Iron Fist/ Open Terrorism. It does so in no uncertain manner.

Many of my fellow accused have described in some detail police terrorism against the workers and strikers. For example, Comrade Radha Raman Mitra thus describes police terrorism during a strike at Asansol: "The Deputy Superintendent of Police of Asansol had established a regime of terror. It was openly a police Raj. Unlawful acts were committed in broad daylight in addition a large number of police was stationed day and night in the workers' bastis. They would not allow any one to stir out of his dwelling after dusk even to answer a call of nature. They would not allow people to stand even on their door-steps.....The Deputy Superintendent of Police used to move about the town with a posse of armed constables; whenever he would come upon a group of strikers, not picketing but simply standing together or quietly chatting in the streets, he would assault them mercilessly and then arrest them on a charge of wrongful assembly or rioting, and if they were severely wounded, would leave them half-dead in the streets, without attending to their wounds or sending them

to the hospital. Many skulls and limbs were fractured and broken.....". All those who have worked in the Trade Union field in India can testify to similar and worse occurrences of police terrorism in all parts of India.

The terrorising of political opinion is as bad in India as in Italy. It is considered a crime to hold any opinions which are not favourable to Imperialism. Imperialism is much helped by its Indian Penal Code. Section 124 A provides a maximum penalty of transportation for life for any one charged with making a so-called seditious speech. Other sections of the law give any executive officer dictatorial powers to ban meetings, demonstrations, assemblies of more than five people, carrying sticks etc. Then the Indian Penal Code contains the magnificent Section 121 A, which provides for conspiracy to deprive the King of his sovereignty of India a maximum penalty of transportation for life. This is the masterpiece of Imperialist legislation. Under this section, people who are merely disliked by the Government can be rounded up without their having committed any offence against the established law, and sentenced to long terms of imprisonment and to transportation for life. It has been explained to us in the present case ad nauseam, that it was not necessary for us to have committed any illegal act, to be sentenced under Section 121 A. It is sufficient for us to have the same opinions, distasteful to Imperialism, to be sentenced for conspiring by legal acts to do an illegal act. Such Sophistry is ridiculous. To sentence a man for life for admittedly no crime, under a section which would be applicable to the majority of the population of the Empire is a stroke of genius.

Imperialism in India makes good use of the present oppressive laws to fight its political adversaries. That is why all the jails in India are full of young men spending the best years of their lives in prison, for doing nothing more than holding opinions distasteful to the Executive. That is why you cannot open an Indian newspaper without finding it full of the reports of political trials.

But even the iniquitous Indian Penal Code is not sufficient for Imperialism. Frequently they do without their law altogether. There is Regulation III of 1818 which allows the Executive to keep people in prison for indefinite periods without trial or hearing. There is the famous Bengal Ordinance which has filled all the jails of Bengal with young men—for the most part innocent of any illegal act—without trial. In what respects, therefore, does the legislation of British Imperialism, differ from that of Fascist Terrorism in Italy? In no respect.

Many political prisoners are not left alone in jail, even after conviction. Systematic attempts are made to break their spirit by continual hardships, punishments and official brutality. Torture itself is by no means unheard of. We have heard of the obscene tortures employed by the police on political prisoners in the lock-ups. Electricity seems to be the favourite method of the C. I. D., because it leaves no injuries. We have heard of prisoners being kept in standing hand-cuffs for days fed on bread and water. We have read in newspapers of political prisoners being suspended by the feet from the roof, we have heard of and seen indiscriminate flogging of political prisoners. For example, in the District Jail, Meerut, at the end of August last year thirteen young Satyagrahi prisoners were mercilessly flogged, being given thirty strokes each, until many were carried away in an unconscious state, for some petty breach of jail discipline, provoked by the jailor. We have heard of false confessions and statements being extorted from prisoners by torture. This being so in what respect do police and jail methods in British India, differ from the police Third Degree in America ? In no respect.

Police terrorism reached its zenith in India last year during the Civil Disobedience Movement. The villagers, growing restive under the yoke of the zemindars and money-lenders, were terrorised by the police to an almost incredible extent. Many were flogged to the point of death and women raped, until whole districts were evacuated and left desolate. The worst example of this was in the Bardoli Taluka and the revelations of Mr. H. N. Brailsford, who investigated the charges by paying a special visit to Bardoli last year, which were published in the Indian press and in the Manchester Guardian are conclusive. There is no doubt that the police practised incredible atrocities on the peasantry in India—atrocities which are unpardonable.

D/- 22.7.31

Other outstanding examples of Police Terrorism during the Civil Disobedience Movement occurred at Peshawar, Sholapur and Chittagong. At Peshawar there was indiscriminate shooting of men, women and children and even the Congress Report prepared by such a hoary old reactionary as Vithalbhai Patel, contained so much material on official terrorism that the Government promptly proscribed it. At Sholapur, martial law was applied and people were sentenced to long terms of imprisonment by military courts for nothing at all. Many were mercilessly flogged by the soldiery and this chapter of repression concluded with the judicial murder by hanging of four innocent men a few days before the notorious

Gandhi-Irwin Pact. After the raid on the armoury at Chittagong in May 1930, Police Terrorism was instituted there and continued up to this day. It is not necessary for me to go into details. The events are too recent for anyone to be ignorant of them. The whole of last year was a chapter of lathi charges, broken heads and betrayed hopes. While MacDonald was mouthing pious platitudes to the delegates of the Round Table Conference in London, his subordinates in India were carrying on a reign of ruthless terror against the Indian masses; and MacDonald and his henchmen were aware of this when they were mumbling about equal partnership and brotherly love.

At the present there is a wide-spread agrarian rebellion in Burma. This rebellion which broke out last year at Tharrawadday has already been continuing for months and all the forces which Imperialism has sent out to quell the rebels, have as yet failed to do so. The Anglo-Indian Press has tried to make out that this rebellion is one of dacoits. It is false. The Burmese peasants have long been smouldering under the weight of oppression and economic misery. Driven to desperation they rose against their oppressors, and are being repressed most vigorously by Imperialism. The recent communique of last week issued by the Burmese Government strongly condemns the action of two of its officers in cutting off the heads of the peasants and exposing them for the intimidation of the public, but refuses to take any action against them because of their good services. This condemnation is worthless, but the fact is demonstrative of the methods by which Imperialism proposes to put down this purely economic uprising with its later political developments. The Times of India and other papers have been attempting to characterise this rebellion as an uprising against Indians. This is only partly true. It is an uprising against Indians—but not against Indians as a nation. It is an uprising against Indian money-lenders—mostly Chettiar of Southern India—who are the immediate exploiters of the poverty-stricken Burmese peasants. Official censorship allows few details of this rebellion to filter through. Eventually, however, we shall know in detail the methods by which Imperialism is suppressing the heroic Burmese peasants—and I have no doubt that they will make gruesome reading.

Individual Terrorism.

I have dealt rather briefly with the Communist theory of violence, having been forced to do so by the distortions and misrepresentations of the Prosecution. For the same reason I have had to explain what is called Red Terror, and have contrasted it with

White Terror. But before I finish altogether with this subject I think it necessary to make a few remarks to show that Red Terror has nothing to do with Individual Terrorism.

I mentioned in the beginning that the Committing Magistrate correctly disassociated us from Individual Terrorism which he confused with Anarchism. Individual Terrorism as practised in India is not by any means the same thing as Anarchism. It is true that the methods of the Terrorists are the same as those of the Anarchists, but the respective aims and objects are totally different.

Anarchism was first heard of in Europe in 1845 by the publication of a book "The Individual and his Property" by Max Stirner the "father of Anarchism." A few years later in 1848 Proudhon, against whose book "the Philosophy of the Poverty" Marx wrote his famous "Poverty of Philosophy", dealt with the same subject and became "the philosopher of Anarchism". But probably the best known of the anarchists are the Russians, Michel Bakounine, whose historic quarrel with Marx led to the schism of the First International, and Prince Peter Kropotkine. In 1894, Plekhanoff, who was then still a Marxist, wrote a pamphlet called "Anarchism and Socialism", which however was severely criticised by Lenin in his "State and Revolution". Lenin says, "He (Plekhanoff) managed somehow to treat this question without touching on the most vital, controversial point, the essential point politically, in the struggle with the anarchists: the relation of the revolution to the State, and the question of the State in general". This is the essential difference between Marxism and Anarchism. Lenin explains this difference clearly and I cannot do better than quote him: "This is what the difference between the Marxists and Anarchists: (1) The Marxists aim at the complete destruction of the State, but recognise that this aim is only attainable after the extinction of classes by a Socialist revolution as a result of the establishment of socialism, leading to the withering away of the State. The anarchists, on the other hand, want the complete destruction of the State within twenty four hours, and do not understand the conditions under which alone such destruction can be carried out.

(2) The Marxists recognise that when once the proletariat has won political power it must utterly break up the old machinery of the State, and substitute for it a new machinery of organised armed workers, after the type of the commune. Anarchists, on the other hand, while advocating the destruction of the State, have no clear idea as to what the proletariat will put in

its place and how it will use its revolutionary power; they even deny that the revolutionary proletariat has any necessity to make use of the State and to establish its revolutionary dictatorship.

(3) Marxists insist upon making use of the modern State as a means of preparing the workers for revolution; anarchists reject all this. (Lenin "State and Revolution", Communist Party of Great Britain, pages 147-148).

If anything further is required there is the testimony of Bakounine himself when reproached at a Congress of "The League of Peace and Liberty", at Berne in 1869, for advocating Communism. "I detest Communism", he stated, "because it is the negation of liberty, and I cannot conceive anything human without liberty. I am not a Communist, because Communism concentrates and causes all ^{the} forces of society to be absorbed by the State, because it necessarily ends in the centralisation of property in the hands of the State, while I desire the abolition of the State—the radical extirpation of this principle of authority and the tutelage of the state, which under the pretext of moralising and civilising men, has until now enslaved, oppressed, exploited and depraved them. I desire the organisation of society and of collective or social property from below upwards, ^{by} means of free association, and not from above downwards by means of some authority of some sort...."

Anarchism, therefore, is a theory of the negation of all authority. The State being authority par excellence must be immediately destroyed altogether, and replaced by no other authoritative body. People will immediately begin to live in "a free association" of equal beings. The guiding principle will be that of "laissez-faire", everybody will do exactly as he likes, which means that nobody will do anything. But what about the bourgeoisie whose State has just been overthrown? Is it going to join this free association of the anarchists? How can counter-revolution and White Terror be counteracted without any organisation or machinery? The anarchist theory is not only utopian—it is arrant nonsense.

It is clear that anarchism has nothing to do with Communism, nor has it any connection in aims and objects with Individual Terrorism.

The universal indignation which swept over India when three terrorists, Bhagat Singh, Rajguru and Sukhdev, were executed only a couple of weeks after the Gandhi-Irwin "Truce" had been signed, was demonstrative of how the terrorist movement had captured the imagination of Indian youths. The numerous

terrorist conspiracy cases which have filled the newspapers for the last three years have forced people to seriously consider the objects and ideals of Individual Terrorism.

In India, at the present stage, terrorism cannot be ignored, neither by the Indian National Congress nor by the Government, nor by the rising working class movement. The undoubted fact that the terrorists by their spectacular acts of retribution, by the fine courage and audacity which most of them display, and by the capacity for suffering, have appealed to the emotions and romanticism of Indian youths, constitutes a problem for the revolutionary Communist movement. Many of the best elements of the petty bourgeoisie are actuated by this emotional romanticism, waste their lives, liberty and energy in a movement which leads to no end. In this way the terrorist movement is a considerable impediment in the way of the growth and development of the Communist movement in India.

The Terrorist movement is essentially petty bourgeois. Its members are chiefly recruited from students and from the bhadralok in general. It is an expression of the discontent and disgust of the petty bourgeoisie against Imperialist oppression and exploitation. Spurred on by discontent and oppression, actuated by sincere social ideals, individual terrorists are totally lacking in scientific or theoretical background for their political activities. In the earlier days of the terrorist movement, its inspiration was a mixture of economic distress, nationalism and religion. In the Deccan the earlier terrorists were devotees of the Marhatta hero Shivaji, and in Bengal of the goddess Kali. But the present terrorist movement has made rapid advances, and has for the most part thrown aside all religious inspirations, and its aim being purely Nationalist is now tending towards Socialism. But the methods adopted by the terrorists are anarchist and not socialist. They are futile and in many respects definitely injurious to the development of a strong mass revolutionary movement in India. The terrorist movement is anti-Imperialist in so far as it is pro-Indian and anti-British. But it is only vaguely aware, if at all, of the fundamental fact of the class-struggle. It does not understand the historical and economic development of society towards a Proletarian revolution and the destruction of the bourgeoisie. It does not understand that the only successful revolution is a class revolution; the revolution of the oppressed class, led by the industrial proletariat, as the only organised disciplined and class conscious unit of the oppressed, against the minority of the oppressing class, is the only revolutionary movement sanctioned by historical and economic development. Individ-

dual assassinations and other terrorist acts are foreign to the class struggle of the oppressed against oppressor. The Communist movement is definitely and emphatically opposed to such acts of individual terrorism. In the first place they are useless, secondly they are wasteful, and thirdly, by giving the authorities a pretext for repression, they tend to destroy organisation.

Communists are opposed to the "removal" of any individual Government official, however vile he may be, not because we believe in such ^{and} ~~sentimental~~ platitudes about "sanctity of human life" or "non-violence" but because we consider it to be futile and unnecessary. Communists stand for mass violence, the violence of one class against another oppressing class, and emphatically reject violence against individuals for obvious reasons.

I have pointed out previously that the State is the instrument of the ruling class and is based on organised violence. To have control of the State is to have the monopoly of violence. Thus, the ruling class can easily cope with any terrorist association whose activities consist of individual acts of violence. The manpower of the Terrorists which is essentially small—is insignificant as compared to the man power of Imperialism. For one Imperialist officer killed by the terrorists there are thousands ready to take his place; for one such act the terrorists lose many of their best elements on the gallows and in life transportation. I have pointed out that the object of all revolutionary movements is to capture the State apparatus, destroy it and set up another which functions in their own interests. The machinery of the Imperialist bourgeois State, having at its command all the means of violence, can easily cope with Individual Terrorism. The State cannot be captured by such means. But before the onslaught of a mass insurrection of the oppressed class, sanctioned by social and economic development, the ruling class is helpless.

I doubt whether the most advanced terrorists really believe that they can capture the machinery of the Imperialist State by the means which they adopt. I am inclined to think that their main object is propaganda. By spectacular acts of terrorism, by patient suffering, by heroic ends on the gallows they aspire to arouse public opinion, they aspire "to make the deaf hear". Liberty, therefore, according to the terrorists is to be achieved by individual self-sacrifice, which by rousing public opinion will ensure the destruction of Imperialism. It does not seem to have been considered that this is a doctrine of political hara-kiri, which inevitably destroys the best elements in their own movement.

Admittedly the activities of the terrorists do create propaganda. But this propaganda is merely emotional and sensational—it is propaganda which destroys organisation and practical work by leading individuals away along the path of utopian romanticism. Then again, what class is affected by this propaganda? Is it the Indian bourgeoisie? The organisation of the bourgeoisie is the Indian National Congress, which aims at a compromise with Imperialism on the basis of commercial and political concessions, and only leads the nationalist movement to betray it by bringing pressure on Imperialism to obtain these bourgeois concessions. Hence its doctrine of non-violence which aims at keeping the mass revolution in check and protecting private property. Do the terrorists expect to influence the Indian bourgeoisie and its political organisation by their propaganda? Obviously not. Since their activities strike at the very *raison d'être* of bourgeois respect for private property.

Is it the peasantry? The peasantry is a scattered, unorganised class, which is concerned only with its immediate economic aims. The character of its work renders it individualist. It is isolated from modern political life; illiterate and so unable to read newspapers etc., and because of its ignorance and isolation certain sections only of the peasantry, and that a minority, the majority being undisturbed, fall easy dupes to the asceticism of "Mahatma Gandhi" and to the empty promises of economic relief given by the bourgeois Congress. It is problematic whether the bulk of the peasantry has even heard of Individual Terrorism, let alone understood it. This being so, do the terrorists expect to influence the peasantry by their propagandist acts? It is impossible. The peasantry is the economic ally of the industrial working class under whose leadership it will eventually, when pressed by economic necessity, overthrow the bourgeois State. Political abstractions which they cannot understand leave the peasantry untouched and undisturbed.

Do the terrorists hope to influence the industrial Proletariat? Again impossible. The industrial Proletariat is an organised disciplined class, whose every nature of work gives it the collective instinct. Thinking and acting collectively they are concerned only with the daily participation in the class struggle. The motive force of the proletariat is economic; it can understand practical organisation which will help it in the struggle against Capitalism. The workers know that they are not fighting individuals but a class. Apart from arousing a momentary interest, acts of terrorism, as they do not affect them as a class either in organisation or in the daily economic struggle, leave them unmoved. The workers live

in the realities of the class-struggle—they have no time for political or emotional abstractions.

The only class of society which is materially influenced by terrorist propagandist acts is the petty bourgeoisie, the students, intellectuals etc. It is an undoubted fact that large sections of the petty bourgeoisie, by reason of poverty and exploitation have developed a strong anti-Imperialist revolutionary instinct. A large number of these are deceived by the catchwords and pseudo-heroic blather of the Indian National Congress and waste their revolutionary energy in propagating Khaddar, boycotting foreign cloth and the other harmless pastimes with which the Congress leaders keep their energetic youths busy, until they themselves sink in the welter of intrigue and political corruption which distinguishes the Congress. A few declass themselves and join the working class movement, thus becoming proletarian intellectuals; but it must be admitted that the majority of these elements of the petty bourgeoisie are influenced by the terrorists.

This influence, however, is based solely on romanticism, emotionalism, and visions of a heroic martyrdom. It is not a constructive organising influence, but one which leads to a chaotic political mentality which causes splendid and courageous young men to throw away lives and liberty in chasing Utopian will-o-the-wisps. This is a deplorable waste of good revolutionary material.

I have no intention of entering into a detailed exposition of the Individual Terrorist movement, but before I close there is one wide-spread fallacy, which I think it necessary to correct.

The terrorist movement in India largely draws its present inspiration from the Civil War in Ireland which resulted in the formation of the Irish Free State. It is believed that the Irish attained their partial—very partial—independence by means of Individual Terrorism. This is however, not correct.

The Irish Republican Army ^{was} a large, well-disciplined body of men, which could be called without exaggeration a national army. Moreover the Irish Republican Army had the active support of the vast majority of the population, who supplied it with food, shelter, and sabotaged the movement of the Imperialist forces. The I.R.A. was in open warfare against the invading forces of a foreign power and naturally had every possible aid and assistance from the population. The Irish army, although numerically powerful, usually avoided open battle with the British troops because it was much inferior in equipment. The I. R. A. because of this was forced to adopt guerilla tactics and what have been mis-called acts

of terrorism were merely acts of open warfare between two opposing armies. There is a great difference between Individual Terrorism and guerilla warfare. The acts of terrorism which certainly did occur were, however, acts of "military terrorism" which are adopted by all countries in time of war—spies are shot, traitors executed and hostages taken and sometimes their lives forfeited. If this can be called Individual Terrorism then the Imperialist troops were more guilty of it than the Irish Republican Army. The events in Ireland were in reality the warfare of one country against another, the rebellion of a whole population, after hundreds of years of preparation, against foreign domination.

This is by no means the situation with the terrorists in India. Comparatively they are very few in number, split up among themselves into different organisations, and apart from the emotional sympathy of the petty bourgeoisie without any active support from the population. They are not even leading the national fight against Imperialism. They are merely a small but sincere unit in the wilderness of pious phrases, hypocrisy and political corruption which distinguishes national politics under the aegis of the present Congress. The war of the terrorists against Imperialism is similar to a heroic war made by an ant against an elephant—wonderful and heroic but nevertheless futile.

I do not wish to be misunderstood. Communists do not deliberately belittle the terrorists. They admire the courage and heroism which they have shown and will continue to show; they admire their obvious sincerity; they strongly sympathise with their great sufferings; but at the same time they emphatically disagree and disapprove of their methods. Knowing as they do that Imperialism and capitalism can only be destroyed by a mass movement, by the revolution of the oppressed class against the class of its oppressors, they consider terrorist activities and their results as waste of good revolutionary material and energy for no material purpose.

Conclusion.

I am charged under section 121 A, with conspiring to deprive the King of his sovereignty of India. I was informed the other day by the Senior Crown Counsel that an accused could not plead justification for such an alleged offence. This was in reply to what I called political justification. Mr. Kemp, however, misunderstood me. When I spoke of political justification I had no thought of the wording of the section under which I am charged. I was merely referring to the justification for having certain political opinions; I was explaining to the Court why I held these opinions

and why I was a Communist by conviction. It was in this sense and in this sense alone that I used the word political justification.

Let us ignore for a moment the law with its sophistries and absurdities and rely on common sense. We are all aware that the flamboyant and pompous wording of the charge against us is ridiculous. The Prosecution Addresses, the evidence that has been put in against us, are all an attempt to prove our political opinions, to prove whether we are Communists. It is admitted that there has been no overt act of violence, and I say that it should be admitted that there is in evidence nothing to prove any illegal act, and the charge of conspiracy against us is merely that of having the same political opinions. Those who admit that they are Communists will undoubtedly be convicted, however weak the evidence is against them, but all those who take up a non-Communist stand, who prove by their defence or by their attitude that they are either anti-Communists or non-Communists will in all probability be acquitted. This has been shown in advance by the recent bail applications. With the exception of Comrade Nimbkar and myself who obtained bail by accident because our case happened to be heard by one of those rare phenomena—an independent Judge—all the others who have been released on bail have openly declared themselves to be non-Communists. This being so, no legal sophistry or confusion of words can alter the fact that the accused in this case are being tried solely for their opinions. The evidence is all documentary and put in with the sole object of proving opinions.

Realising this, I have been at some pains, to explain my opinions. I have openly admitted that I am a Communist by conviction, but it was necessary for me to answer the distortions of the Communist theory and practice with which the Prosecution has attempted at different times to exaggerate and prejudice our case. The opening address of the late Mr. Langford James both in this Court and the Lower Court was a fanrago of falsehoods and distortions. He was allowed to deliver it before this Court for more than ten days without any interruption from the Court. Yet whenever we attempt to answer these falsehoods and distortions which prejudice our case the relevancy is at once questioned. This is manifestly unfair. The assessors represent the general public in this Court. Mr. Langford James laboured for more than ten days in this Court to fill their minds with political prejudice by a series of distortions and lies, in the hope of obtaining from them a verdict of guilty which would afterwards be used by the Government as showing public approval of our conviction. It is, in consequence very important for us to expose these distortions and falsehoods and to make our political theory absolutely clear.

With this object in view I have confined myself to explaining those points of the Communist theory which the Prosecution have much distorted and energetically used to secure our conviction. First of all I dealt at length with the Communist theory of violence, because both in the Prosecution Opening Address, the Committal Order and more recently in a long affidavit on the subject by Mr. Khairat Nabi submitted to prejudice the High Court, it has been made the most vital legal issue in the present case. Secondly, I have quoted several false propagandist statements of the late Mr. Langford James about Red Terror, and have answered them and exposed their gross falsity, by explaining in full what Red Terror really is. I have also attempted to draw a striking contrast between Red Terror and the much more ferocious White Terror and have explained that the latter was the cause of the former. Thirdly I have dealt cursorily with Individual Terrorism in order to show that it has no connection whatsoever with Red Terror. At the same time I have explained several of the views expressed by me in my speeches. If while doing this I have succeeded in drawing up a terrible indictment of Imperialism and the bourgeoisie in general, it is not my fault but that of Imperialism and the bourgeoisie.

You, Sir, while I was dealing with the subject of Red Terror, questioned its relevancy to the present case. I drew your attention to the statements made by the late Mr. Langford James on this subject, with the object of prejudicing the case against us. I think that you were satisfied. To allow the Prosecution to distort our opinions without allowing the accused to reply would be a grotesque procedure. I challenge anyone to prove, without making himself ridiculous, that any single line of my statement is irrelevant to the present case. I have attempted to make a clear and frank statement of my political opinions. I have not attempted to evade any issue, nor have I quibbled about any of the opinions that I am reputed to have expressed before my arrest. I have made no secret of the fact that I am a Communist by conviction, and I have no doubt that I shall be convicted.

But to convict me of conspiracy is absurd. All my actions up to my arrest have been open and above-board; in spite of this I was arrested and brought to a place I had never heard of, much less visited, to be tried with men the majority of whom I had never met or heard of. The sole charge of conspiracy consists of the admitted fact that many of us have the same political opinions. But besides having political opinions, we are charged with organising the workers. To make a charge like this a basis of conspiracy is taking us back to the ferocious Anti-Combination Laws of England at the beginning of the 19th century. The

"crimes" alleged against us are perfectly legal in every bourgeois Democracy of the world. The fact that the supposed co-conspirators in the present case, who live in England or elsewhere, have not been arrested, proves to the hilt that at the present time public opinion in those countries would never have tolerated such a flagrant interference with freedom of thought and political and Trade Union organisation, as the Indian Government has committed in this case.

I am not ashamed of any single act of mine. Nor am I repentant. You may convict me, but whatever you might write in your final order, will not alter the fact that I have been convicted only for my opinions and acts which are held to be legal and normal in every country in the world which is not under a raging White Terror. I have no fear of class justice, and I am satisfied that this case will be a landmark in the history of the working-class movement in India. It will be recorded as one of the greatest pseudo-judicial scandals in the history of mankind I have no more to say.

Q. What about your defence witnesses ?

A. I am not in a position to give a reply yet.

Q. You have now read over your statement and it has been corrected and amended as and where requested by you. Are you now satisfied that the above is a correct record of your statement.

A. Yes.

Sd. H. L. Hutchinson

27/X/31.

Sd. R. L. Yorke

27/X/31.

Certified that the above is a full and true account of the statement of Hutchinson accused taken down by stenographers in my presence and hearing and subsequently transcribed by them and corrected and amended as and where requested by him and admitted by him to be correct.

Sd. R. L. Yorke

27/X/31.

*In the Court of R. L. Yorke Esqr. I. C. S. Addl. Sessions
Judge Meerut*

In the case of King Emperor versus P. Spratt and others
Examination of S. S. Mirajkar accused under section 342 of the
Code of Criminal Procedure, 1898, made before me R. L. Yorke,
Addl. Sessions Judge at Meerut on the 26th day of October 1931.

My name is Shantaram Savlaram Mirajkar; my father's
name is Savlaram Hengdappa Mirajkar; I am by caste No Caste;
30 years of age; by occupation Clerk, Journalist and Labour
organiser; my home is at Dadar, Police-station Dadar, district
Bombay, I reside at Bombay.

Q. You heard your statement in the Lower Court P 2639
read out to you on 17. 3. 31. Is that statement correct?

On Statements in the Lower Court.

A. Yes. But I want to say something more about it.

In this connection much capital has been made of the fact
that accused did not make full statements in the Lower Court. I
therefore propose to make a few observations on this point. Firstly
it must be remembered that the Prosecution were producing their
wagon-load of evidence at such a speed that it was a stupendous
task to follow the evidence and all sorts of documents produced.
Most of these documents and papers are irrelevant, and the defence
lawyers as well as the accused were not in a position to discuss the
admissibility of each document, and I think that it was a well-
organised plan on the part of the Prosecution, to put in all sorts
of papers whether relevant or otherwise, so that the Defence will
not be able to object to anything at all. Under these circumstances
when the Magistrate called upon us to make the statements most of
the accused had not even seen, much less carefully studied, all the
documents against them. How would then expect us to make our
full statements? The Committing Magistrate in his Committal
Order has noted this fact on page 12 as follows:—"The exhibits
were put in at such a rate that it was impossible, without prolonging
the inquiry inordinately, to examine each exhibit, as it was put in.
As a matter of fact in spite of devoting one day in a week and
often more, to the examination of exhibits, the examination was
barely finished before the defence were called upon to argue." As
a matter of fact it would have been quite within our right to
examine each exhibit and argue its relevancy while it was being
produced. And if this course had been followed which was quite
legal and legitimate, I wonder if the learned Magistrate would have
been able to enjoy his long holidays in England today. The

accused therefore have clearly behaved quite reasonably, even at some sacrifice. And still we are charged with deliberately adopting dilatory tactics not only by the High Court Judges, but even the House of Commons has been made a platform for repeating this charge. I shall later show how this charge has no basis at all. Here I shall only say that the fraudulent Prosecution is to be blamed for the unjustifiable delay in this case. I definitely charge the Prosecution that it has deliberately and consciously prolonged this prosecution in order to harass us by producing all sorts of unnecessary and irrelevant evidence, books, pamphlets and papers. Let Mr. Wedgwood Benn, the late Labour State Secretary, and Sir Samuel Hoare, the present National Government State Secretary, understand these facts. Let them not like parrots repeat what their underlings in India ask them to from the platform of the House of Commons. Coming to the point therefore as to why we had not made our statements in the Lower Court I maintain that the Magistrate has himself explained it, and it is hardly necessary for me to say anything more. If we had had proper opportunity of examining the documents produced against us, most certainly we should have made our statements in the Lower Court. One point more and I shall have finished the reply on this particular point. Of what avail was the explanation given by several of the accused in the Lower Court? The Junior Public Prosecutor while closing the Crown case in the Lower Court said that if there were any genuine Trade Unionists and Congressmen amongst the accused, well, they should not be committed to the Sessions. Well, Sir, since the statements began in this court as well as in the Lower Court, several of them promptly told you as well as the Magistrate that they were not Communists, that they were genuine Joshi brand Trade Unionists. Still what is the result? Has the Magistrate let them off in spite of their explanation? No. Before I finish I wish to recommend to your Honour for immediate release of all those who are not Communists, particularly those who have rightly earned their freedom by abusing the Communists, Communism and the Soviet Union. If your Honour has got any respect for the Imperialist laws which you and other Imperialist slaves make and administer you will forthwith carry out my recommendation. I have finished this particular subject.

Q. The following documents relate to your foreign connections:—

P 1144, 1235, 1355 (5), 1828, 1838, 1839, 1840, 2328P2, 2418P, 1009, 1350 (3), 1350 (5), 2137P, 230, 1233, 1350 (2), 1355(2), 1355 (3), 1633 and 1610. Have you anything to say about this evidence?

Early History

A. Before I begin to explain my foreign connections and papers I should like to briefly state a short early history of events which would help me to explain my foreign connections better. While doing so I do not wish to take more time of the court as well as nor do I wish to waste my own time. In brief I may say that up to September, 1927, I led the life of a bank clerk and had the same experience which any member of the exploited class does in the process of class struggle. In September 1926 I was elected the Secretary of the small Labour Group which later became the Congress Labour Party. Many members of the Bombay Provincial Congress Committee participated in this organisation. This very organisation later on evolved itself into the Workers' and Peasants' Party of Bombay, and I was elected its first General Secretary. In May 1927 I published a pamphlet called "India and China" which was prefaced by Comrade S. Saklatwala M. P. with the following words:—

"All I have to say to the people of India on this subject is—
go and do likewise."

The red cover of this booklet also was ridiculously made much of by the Prosecution when our trial under section 124 A began in Bombay. In the month of June the book was proscribed by the Bombay Government. A hunt for the copies of this little booklet was conducted by the ever ready C. I. D. Police, several house searches were made throughout India including my house and the Bombay Workers' and Peasants' Party's offices (P.W.244). In the month of August, 1927, Comrade Spratt was arrested under section 124A as the author of the pamphlet, and I was arrested on the 20th September 1927 under the same section as publisher of the pamphlet. This arrest frightened the mighty Imperialist Government out of their wits. Comrade Spratt was not allowed freedom on bail even in that case although every effort to obtain it was made. He had to remain in the Arthur Road prison as the guest of His Majesty for more than two months. The High Court Sessions Trial began in the month of November 1927, and the Prosecution could not prevent Comrade Spratt from the privilege of getting a trial by jury, who brought a verdict of not guilty with only one amongst the nine jurors dissenting. The High Court Judge, Mr. Justice Fawcett, who later became the Chairman of the Fawcett Inquiry Committee—had no other alternative but to acquit Comrade Spratt. The case against me was withdrawn by the Prosecution. Had this Prosecution not failed in Bombay, had the Bombay Police succeeded in securing our conviction it is very difficult to say whether this Meerut drama would have been staged at all.

Frightened by my arrest and trial my French employers who had already been instigated by the C. I. D. officials to deprive me of my job at last asked me to quit, which I did. P. W. 182, Mr. Derojinsky and the Deputy Commissioner, Mr. Jacob, who was to be a witness in this case, constantly used to visit my French Manager and tell him all sorts of stories about my alleged Communist activities, even when I was not a member of the Communist Party. My boss on more than one occasion tried to persuade me to give up my then very limited activities. At last I lost my job in September 1927 and with it my bread and butter was also gone. Thereafter constant unemployment and its consequent resultants were worrying me and my family. I suffered very miserably as a result of all these. I tried to get another job; but the omnipotent and omnipresent Police would always interfere and would not enable me to get an employment. At the same time unemployment was menacingly growing with such a rapidity that every commercial firm and bank were prominently displaying "no vacancy" signboards in their offices in order to avoid the waste of time in talking to innumerable job hunters. While all these things were happening my revolutionary determination to serve the workers' cause was becoming still more resolute. I used to attend practically all the Trade Union meetings, which will be shown from the reports appearing in the Kranti. And in this way I became intimately conversant with the horrible conditions of life Capitalism has imposed upon the workers. This intimate knowledge about the abominable conditions of the workers' life further contributed to harden my revolutionary allegiance to the workers' movement.

The arrests and searches by Police, my trial, loss of the job, experiences of unemployment and above all the workers' harrowing conditions seem, and intimately known by me for the first time in my life, all these instead of dissuading me from being a Communist, drove me to the Party, and I became a Party Communist by 1928, which I continued to be up to the time of my arrest.

I may here inform the Court that up to the time of my arrest the Communist Party of India was not affiliated to the Comintern, although personally I would have approved of such an affiliation without any hesitation. The Prosecution is assuming that the C.P.I. was affiliated to the Communist International. It is building its entire house on the surface of water. But I want to inform them that unfortunately its assumption is not true. If it were so the Communist accused in this case would not hesitate to admit it.

Without any further digression I may say, sir, that this is in short my account. I know what my deserts are and I also know

that this is a class court where in this mock trial is conducted, is going to give me the highest punishment according as the needs of the Imperialist ruling class. And I am ever ready of receiving it without a word of murmur as fearlessly as I am declaring my political faith here in this Court. Before I conclude this, I may point out how wild imagination has run amuck and irresponsible and inaccurate statements were made by Junior Public Prosecutor while summing up the individual cases before the Committing Magistrate. He said about me as follows:—

“Mr. Mirajkar came to the notice of the Police in the year 1925 when he was writing to the Communist bookshop for the Communist literature.” This statement is pure imagination and has absolutely no basis whatever. The Prosecution evidence does not support it. Therefore to put it very mildly it is a wild statement.

The brief account I have told you is absolutely correct though I do not want to secure from your Honour a certificate about my truthfulness. I hope that the Prosecution, while summing up their individual cases in this Court will make their statements which are supported by the evidence lest they should get their own case damaged by making extravagantly imaginary statements of the type I have mentioned above.

Clerks life in Bombay

I now propose to depict the life and hardships which the clerks in Bombay suffer from, as I know best from my personal experience. I have already told you that I was a bank clerk for more than seven years and in September 1927 I was victimised for my political work. During all this period I was all along making an effort to organise a Trade Union for the Bombay clerks. In the year 1924 there existed in Bombay a Clerks' Union of which I was then a member. But within about a couple of years this Union went out of existence. In the year 1927 I made a great effort to revive that organisation because I felt that a strongly organised Clerks' Union was a dire necessity to fight against the growing attack of the employers. I myself being a clerk knew very well what terrible distress the whole clerical community was thrown into. Your Honour will find from the "Kranti" issues that I issued appeals to Bombay clerks to organise a Trade Union to improve the worsened conditions of the clerks. I called several meetings and in these tried to explain to my fellow clerks the urgent necessity of such an organisation.

Clerks employed in the private commercial firms, banks,

insurance offices, trading firms in Bombay number several thousands. Their wage conditions are not regulated. It entirely depends upon the demand and supply basis. And particularly in the year 1927, due to the economic crisis that had begun, there was a huge army of unemployed. Naturally when such unemployment prevailed, the wages of the clerks had considerably come down. Firms began to advertise jobs of Rs 30 and Rs 40 a month. The disparity between wages and prices naturally made life miserable for them. The hours of work of these human machines are never regulated, and I know from my personal experience that these clerks have to work more than 10-12 hours a day for a starvation wage. There are no rules regarding pension or provident fund in most of these offices. There are no service rules and no stability about the employment. Any day the whim of the manager would throw the clerk in the ever increasing unemployed army. There are nominal bank holidays which do not go beyond more than four days at a time; but in several of these offices these miserable clerks are made to attend offices and work even on holidays. In short the life of a Bombay clerk is much worse than even the life of a manual worker. I say this again from my knowledge. Manual workers at least come together and unite very soon whenever they smell a common danger against them; but these half educated clerks have not got that consciousness and feelings of solidarity which the manual workers have.

In addition to this miserable condition of wages, want of holidays, rules regarding pensions, provident fund etc., clerks have to live in cities where the cost of living is already very high; they have to live and dress themselves in a "respectable" manner and have to travel to work every day. This further adds to their miseries and consequently life is very hard.

Lack of organisation and united action against the employers, who exploit them as much as the ordinary manual workers are exploited, is another handicap. Clerks generally or at any rate majority of them consider that such organisation as a Trade Union is below their dignity. They think that these organisations are only formed by manual workers and they (the clerks) pride themselves by saying that they are not ordinary workers, they are "educated" and "respectable" clerks. Whenever I spoke to my fellow clerks about starting a Trade Union for clerks, the stock replies such as above were given to me. Little did they understand that Capitalism unitedly and in an organised manner was exploiting them; and possibly the forms of exploitation were much worse in this case than in the case of millworkers or dock workers or any other manual workers. I used to point out to them how banks have

their closer corporations, how insurance companies have their common associations, how other commercial firms have their chambers of commerce and how the share-brokers' firms are united in the Share-brokers' Associations. If even the employers find it necessary to organise into a sort of a union embracing the members of its own class, how much more we poor, uncared for, badly paid clerks must organise ourselves into a fighting organisation and utilise our united strength in checking the attack of the employing class. But my argument would not yield much result. The reason of it all being that clerks are not as rebellious as other workers are.

In western countries also clerks are not properly organised though of course they have some sort of organisations. Besides there are rules and regulations regarding services; and these service rules give them greater protection than in India. Here, however, there are generally no rules that give any protection except possibly in the Government services. Their condition is therefore no better than slaves; only they can be called "palace slaves" as opposed to "plantation slaves" or of the factories etc. But they are slaves none the less and have every cause to be discontented and fight their exploiters.

Whenever and whenever there are organisations of clerks, they are not properly organised. They ought to join with other workers and make a common cause with them. For instance clerks in the G. I. P. and B. B. C. I. Railway Offices must unite with other workers. If all the clerks including workers unite in this manner in a strong and powerful union, the employers will be forced to respect their organisations. If the clerks in Bombay, the office peons, the watchmen and all other employees all together unite in a Trade Union, the employers will think twice before they turn down their demands for more wages and better service conditions. But generally the tendency of clerks is to have no organisation and if at all, a separate organisation. Peons organise themselves into yet another separate union. For instance the Bombay Banks peons have their separate Trade Union and Bank clerks have no organisation at all. In this manner the fighting strength is divided; and neither of them succeed in getting their demands enforced upon the employers. I have already said that the clerks are not rebellious and they keep themselves aloof from the real fighting elements namely the peons, watchmen, menial staff etc. etc. and the result is that the employers exploit both of them. I therefore suggested to many of my fellow clerks to organise on the basis indicated as above. Postal clerks should join hands with other postal employees, railway clerks with railwaymen etc. There are many clerks in cities and towns not closely associated with other

workers, such as in business offices, in commercial firms, in solicitors' offices, in shops, in Government offices etc. All these should be organised together with peons, watchmen, darwans, salesmen, shorthand typists into strong, powerful Trade Union, and not as the Government encourages its clerical workers to organise in a number of separate unions, dividing their strength, like the Currency Office Association. The former is the only way to organise effectively, the latter is the deliberate dissipation of our strength which the crafty employers want in their interests.

The clerk's Union that was in existence in 1924 was not effectively organised in the manner as I have pointed above, the result was that it proved ineffective and consequently it went out of existence. Also in Bombay there are separate organisations of both clerks and peons such as Bank Peons' Union, Shorthand Typists' Association, South Indian Clerks' Association, Government Peons and Menials' Unions, Mill Workers' Union etc. All these, if they desire to be effective in wresting their rightful demands from the hands of the employing class, must unite to put up a united front against their exploiting employers. So also the tendency of organisation on provincial basis is definitely harmful. These are primarily economic organisations brought into being for safeguarding the economic rights first and foremost. They have to fight against the employers who as the master class, harass and exploit the servant class by reducing their wages, by creating unemployment among the employees by artificial means, and by various other crafty and cunning methods. They do this in order to make more profit. We also must therefore organise on economic basis in order to defeat the purpose of the blood-sucking employing class and the pernicious principles of caste, creed and province should not be introduced in these organisations. The only thing we must recognise is the "class principle." We are an exploited class; before us is the exploiting class which is enslaving us for profit, power, happiness and pleasure of its own class. If clerks seriously organise themselves on the lines indicated above I am sure their conditions will be very rapidly improved. If they genuinely enter the Trade Union Movement, they will not only be able to help themselves but some of them will also be the leaders of the movement against Capitalism.

Such a properly and effectively organised Trade Union must be further strengthened by affiliating it to the Trade Union Congress, it must form part of the general Labour Movement. Capitalist class is closely interconnected and hence very powerful. To fight such a powerful enemy we too must interconnect ourselves with all the fighting organisations.

I was working among the clerks with these ideas in my mind and I often discussed them with my fellow clerks. I also wanted to propagate the ideas of Communism among them. Usually the clerks are timid and reactionary. But actually because of their horrible conditions, they have good reasons to support Communism. Under Capitalism they have as hard a life as other workers; and as a matter of fact, conditions are getting worse, owing to depression. During Trade slumps clerks are usually the worst to suffer, as employers know that they could not resist. Further there is in India continuous heavy unemployment among the clerks and similar types of workers. Exact unemployment statistics are not available in India but the figures will surely run into several millions. Bombay Labour Office feebly attempted to ascertain the extent of unemployment among the middle classes in 1925. But the full statistics could not be gathered and the efforts did not succeed. In the year 1926, a new method of collecting unemployment statistics was adopted by the Labour Office. Printed schedules to be filled up by the unemployed were distributed to various firms, offices, schools and colleges. How fruitless the effort was, can be seen from the return of these schedules. Out of the total of 20446 schedules distributed throughout the Bombay Presidency only 2575 were received back, duly filled up, by the Labour Office. The number of these schedules was defective and out of them only 1852 were accepted for final tabulation. (Labour Gazette July 1927.)

D/27. 10. 31

The unemployment statistics can only be ascertained by the establishment of proper unemployment registration bureaus by the Government in all towns and cities, where every unemployed will go and compulsorily register himself.

Another experiment has been tried at various places like Bombay, Madras, Calcutta etc of putting an advertisement in the newspapers for a post of clerk. The result is always the same—many hundreds of applications. This proves the acuteness of unemployment among the clerks. We often read in the newspapers cases of suicide due to long unemployment. Recently there was a case in Bombay of a clerk who killed his grown-up daughter and himself committed suicide, the reason given for such extreme acts was unendurable miseries of long term unemployment.

Only possible remedy that every-body knows is the expansion of Industry of the country and the development of its mineral, agricultural and forest resources in a scientific way; and expansion of the social services such as education etc. wherein people of the type of clerks and intellectuals generally can be employed.

This cannot happen under Imperialism which prevents industrial and other development of the country. Probably this also cannot happen even if the Indian Capitalism gets its Dominion Status or "substance of Independence", which, of course, it will not for no capitalist country is expending its Industry or developing social services now-a-days. Due to economic world crisis it has become quite impossible for the Capitalist countries to expand their Industries, nor are they in a position to plan their economy as is the Soviet Union.

But there is good reason to expect such an expansion of Industry under the workers' and peasants' rule which we Communists fight for. Like the Soviet Union the Indian workers' and peasants' Republic will be able to expand its resources, its Industry and its social services rapidly in all directions, so that, as in the U.S.S.R., in a few years there will be no unemployment at all; but shortage of labour of all kinds, and generally there will be a rising standard of life for all workers. We shall then also get increasing social amenities.

The Five-Years-Plan of the Soviet Union has to-day succeeded to such an extent that the whole Capitalist economy feels in it a sort of challenge to its own existence. The tremendous expansion of Industry and rapid development of agriculture have raised the general standard of living for workers and peasants, uprooted the evil of unemployment; the Capitalist world is forced to recognise these facts. Today what Soviet Russia needs most in both skilled and unskilled Labour, and the Union employs thousands of American workers. Whereas all Capitalist countries, including those most highly developed industrially have their huge unemployed army which clearly demonstrates the utter failure of the Capitalist economy, on other hand the Soviet Union has very definitely proved its superiority in tackling the economic problems. That is why Communists stand for complete destruction of Capitalism and Imperialist States and instead establish workers' and peasants' rule which alone is capable of looking after the interests of workers, peasants, soldiers, clerks and such other toiling humanity.

Therefore I say that clerks and the "intellectual" strata generally have a direct material interest in the success of our policy. I always considered that it is necessary to carry on propaganda among these exploited clerks and win them over to our side. I attempted to do so whenever I got an opportunity. I am also of the opinion that it is not altogether a hopeless job. In other countries considerable number of clerks have joined the Communist Movement and helped it appreciably. In India where there is very small percentage of literacy and greater exploitation, this section can very easily be won over for Communist policy and work.

Lastly I appeal to my suffering and exploited fellow clerks, to whose fraternity I once belonged, to understand the Capitalist method of plunder and exploitation, to shake off their suicidal docility and organise themselves under the revolutionary leadership of the Communist Party, which is working for the complete unihilation of the regime of Capitalism and Imperialism and for the establishment of workers' and peasants' rule, under which the toilers of India will live a life worth living, will enjoy happiness and liberty which they alone, as useful members of society, have the right to enjoy.

Foreign Connections.

Now I shall proceed to say something about my alleged foreign connections. Your Honour has asked me this question only to connect me and my activities with certain organisations outside India, which are looked upon as a bugbear by the British Imperialists. I do not think that this Court ever objects to having any foreign connections but the Government, this Court and British Imperialism object to having connections with particular organisations such as mentioned in the long list submitted by the Prosecution. If I had corresponded with the Labour Party in England, the International Labour office in Geneva, Independent Labour Party or the American Federation of Labour, it would not have been looked upon as an offence; but the moment you write an ordinary letter to the Communist Party of Great Britain, to the Editor of the Daily Worker or to the Secretary of the League against Imperialism, the C. I. D. Police officials busy themselves in stealing it from the Post Office, photo cameras begin to operate, photo copies are made and are safely put under lock and key of the Simla offices, to be used as ready evidence in farcical conspiracy cases like the present one. We have on record a number of letters from the League against Imperialism addressed not only to the accused but to persons comparatively less harmful from the point of view of Imperialism such as the late Pandit Motilal Nehru and his son Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru. A question therefore naturally arises as to why these foreign organisations only are made a target of attack and why not the organisations such as the Labour Party, the Geneva organisations etc. etc. As a matter of fact the Government of India encourages connections and contracts with the latter by sending delegates to the periodical conferences and meetings, and spends a huge amount of money on these favourites of the Government. Why? The answer is very simple.

The first type of organisations fights for and assists in organising the exploited masses of peasants and workers in order to overthrow the Imperialist domination and break into pieces the heavy

iron chains that bind the masses of India and give them the message of hope and freedom, while the latter, namely the Geneva Show and its allied bodies which are the direct creations of the Capitalist States in order to control the growing revolutionary movement of the International working class, are there to preserve our chains for ever and make us slaves of Capitalism and Imperialism. The workers of the world are realising this fact very rapidly. They are, as this realisation dawns upon them, leaving a camp of traitors. The present day Capitalist crisis throughout the world and particularly in the European countries—the stronghold of modern Capitalism—accelerates this realisation on the part of the workers.

It is therefore quite natural that those organisations which actively assist in the struggle of the oppressed people should be regarded by the Imperialist Government and its courts as their enemies and as such dangerous.

In the strike wave that swept over the country during the years 1927, 1928 and 1929, the Indian working class was very substantially assisted by the foreign organisations such as R.I.L.U., League against Imperialism, Pan Pacific Trade Union Secretariat, the Workers' Welfare League in England etc. as a result of which the Indian working class has very rapidly grasped the fact that these organisations alone are our true supporters in our anti-Imperialist and anti-Capitalist struggle. As against this, while the 1929 General Strike of the Textile workers was going on in Bombay, the G.K.U., the organiser and the leader of this strike, was condemned by the General Council of the British Trade Union Congress as a Communist Union. The plain meaning of this move was to ask the Government of India to suppress this largest and strongly-built organisation of the class-conscious working class which just prior to our arrest had become a terror not only to the Bombay mill-owners alone but to the whole Indian Capitalist class. The Government and the Indian Capitalists were not slow in adopting the suggestion of these scoundrels who formed the General Council of the British Trade Union Congress, because in the rising working class and their organisations such as G. K. U. and the G.I.P. Union the Indian Capitalist class and the ruling British Imperialists clearly saw their destruction.

There is nothing surprising therefore in the efforts of this Court to illegalise these foreign organisations in order to protect Imperialist rule, which is in legal parlance called by the grandiloquent name "the sovereignty of His Majesty". This individual who goes by the name of His Majesty is not in any way interested in grabbing the vast regions of the earth individually. He does not eat or drink more than an ordinary mortal does. Who then

wants to maintain this "sovereignty of His Majesty" by enslaving, oppressing millions and millions of people and why? Even if His All Gracious Royal Majesty King George the V were confronted with this question, he would frankly admit that he is nobody and he personally has no interests in carrying on the colossal exploitation. Communists therefore are right when they say that "His Majesty's sovereignty" is a myth; it is the sovereignty of British Imperialism and Capitalism. And His Majesty is only a puppet in their hands. And I frankly admit that I am out to destroy the sovereignty of the British Capital, call it "His Majesty's sovereignty" if you please or whatever else you like.

In doing this, I maintain it is the inherent right of the working class to ally and maintain contact with all the anti-Imperialist organisations in other countries. And the correspondence which has been produced against me by the Prosecution, although it is of a very ordinary character, has the significance which I have elucidated, and this must not be forgotten by your Honour.

It is quite apparent that efforts are made to stamp these organisations and contacts therewith as illegal and stop them. I want to declare in this connection that these efforts can never succeed. We shall carry on this correspondence. We shall maintain contact with all these foreign organisations which we believe are furthering and assisting the cause of the Proletarian Revolution, whether legally or illegally. Communists make no fetish of legal or illegal means. If legal channels are closed to us, we shall be forced to take recourse to illegal methods; but the revolutionary activity must and shall proceed unceasingly whether the Imperialist rulers like it or not.

There is a certain amount of alleged correspondence in code adduced by the Prosecution in this Court as evidence against us. I do not want to say anything about its genuineness; it is for the Prosecution to prove it to the satisfaction of the Court; but let us assume for a moment that all that correspondence is genuine, why are the authors of the correspondence forced to take to these methods? If there had been freedom to express one's views openly, to write and correspond anything one liked, would these persons have resorted to these methods then? The answer is an emphatic 'No'. Who then drives sane and sober-minded people to take to the methods of code and civilisation? The Imperialist ruling class and their ruthless censorship, C. I. D. surveillance, Post Office and Customs regulations and such other blockades. There is nothing surprising that people who are determined to destroy the whole Capitalist system of society should resort to any methods

whether legal or illegal in order to achieve their ends. On the other hand their actions receive a moral justification, backing and support to these acts, when the ruling class forges such weapons of sabotage as I have just mentioned. I again want to impress upon this Court that the revolutionary Proletarian Movement cannot be stopped by any efforts of the moribund Capitalist ruling class until the whole system is completely annihilated.

I unhesitatingly admit my connections with these organisations and I feel very proud about it. I unflinchingly maintain that it is our right to carry on such correspondence and keep contact with the revolutionary organisations abroad by any possible means. We shall do it whether Imperialism likes it or not.

Now I would like to say a few remarks in relation to P. 1838, 1839 and 1840. These, according to the Prosecution, were three packets of books and they were taken possession of by the Police under the Sea Customs Act. P. W. 250 Inspector Dost Mohammad has admitted in this cross-examination that the packets were sent to the C. I. D. by the Post Office and none of the books contained in those packets was returned to me. He has also said that "there was nothing on the packets to show who sent them." Speaking for myself I never knew whether any such books were sent to me at all; and the first time I knew of them was when this witness produced this list in the Lower Court. It is also very surprising to me that these packets could not show the name of the sender of these books. This circumstance particularly makes me rather suspicious about the actual contents of these packets. Besides the Prosecution has not produced these books in this Court nor in the Lower Court. Therefore this in my opinion is a clear case of fabrication of evidence at which Indian C. I. D.'s are notoriously far more capable than their brethren in any other country.

P230: I remember to have issued an appeal like this in Bombay when comrade Spratt was arrested and a Defence Committee was formed of which I was the Secretary. With regard to the portion, I mean the manuscript writing, on the reverse I do not know anything about it.

With regard to other exhibits put to me by your Honour I do not think that any explanation is necessary. I do not want to admit them nor do I want to say anything particular about them.

Q. The following documents relate to your connections with the W. P. P. of Bombay, other W. P. P.'s and the A.I.W.P. P.

I. W. P. P. of Bombay:—P 1835, 1942, 855, 854, 853, 852, 850, 851, 1017, 1355, 7A, 7B, 7C, 1355(4), 1511, 844, 1353, 1343,

1344, 1348 (12), 1373 (16) (6), 1940, 1015, 1375 Kranti of 14th and 21st May 1927, 1351, 1349 (2), 839, 1010, 1011, 2311, 1748, 1358, 1373(12) 1973, 1685, 1375 Kranti (passim); 837, 526 (27), 835, 832, 548(10) 878, 1331, 1348 (41) (50) (13) (18) (15) (17) and (2), 1602, 1373 (1) 1109, 1691, 990 Kranti of 3, 3, 29 and 1170.

II. Bengal W. P. P.:—P 52, 1616.

III. Punjab ,, :—P 1408, 1409, 1626, 1642, 1234.

IV. U. P. ,, :—P1110 and 1631P.

V. A. I. W. P. P. :—P 1763, 1764, 1231 (596) and 669.

Have you anything to say about this evidence ?

A. I shall deal later with regard to these documents put to me by the Court. For the present I shall go on with what I want to say in connection with the fairness of trialst that has been made much of from time to time.

The accused in this case stand charged of having conspired to deprive His Majesty of the Sovereignty of British India. This is a crime under the Imperialist Penal Code and is punishable with transportation for life. In the beginning of the Sessions trial we pleaded not guilty. We have pleaded not guilty not because we expect justice from this Court or from any other court under Imperialism, not because we have any illusions as to the class character of these courts, not because we believe in the bourgeois fiction of classless impartial justice, but in doing so we are solely guided by the desire to prove before a highest tribunal—the tribunal of the toiling millions of this land that the aims and actions which have been stigmatised here as a criminal conspiracy are precisely the aims and actions which are historically necessary in the interests of the advancement and progress of Indian society as a whole.

Further this criminal conspiracy—if it is a conspiracy at all—is a conspiracy of the very conditions of unspeakable misery and poverty of the toiling masses—of the conditions of abject slavery and serfdom—of the ruthless exploitation and plunder. This conspiracy of objective conditions is directed against that system—order of society—which makes these conditions possible, against the Imperialist robbers and their flunkies who are paid to maintain these conditions intact. The existence of such a wide-spread conspiracy is a terror and menace to Imperialism, no doubt. But from the point of view of society as a whole, it is but a healthy sign of vitality and vigour. Given the conditions just mentioned every healthy society must necessarily engender counter-forces which tend to burst the bonds which chain progress, and pave the

way for the reconstruction of society on a higher basis. If this conspiracy is criminal, it can only be criminal from the point of view of Imperialist Penal Code which is drafted with the express purpose of putting down all fighters of freedom, all champions of progress, all those who dare to stand up against the Imperialist exploitation. It is criminal from the point of view of the foreign Imperialist masters of this country, their feudal allies, their mean hirelings and their Police-brained apologists.

The evidence brought forward by the Prosecution boils down to the following allegations:—

(1) That the accused participated in the Trade Union activities, led strikes and instilled into the workers the need for sound organisation class, consciousness and solidarity.

(2) That the accused established workers' and Peasants' Parties whose object was to strive for the complete national Independence of India.

(3) That the accused advocated through their speeches, writings, demonstrations and processions etc the idea that the root cause of the misery and the poverty of the toiling masses was the domination of Imperialism. They pointed out that Imperialism was a moribund phase of Capitalism and as such its downfall was inevitable. They held forth the lofty ideal of Communist classless society before the workers and peasants of India and indicated the methods and stages through which this ideal is to be attained.

(4) That the accused strove to establish and maintain a contact between the emancipatory movement of the workers and peasants of India and the International Labour Organisations of Soviet Russia, Great Britain and Germany.

But this is all prosaic and sounds quite harmless to the public. There were no revolvers, no bombs, no sensational tales of murder, hence the prosecution felt it necessary to paint behind these simple facts the "horrid" background of Red Terror, of Bolshevik brutality, of the anarchy, chaos and ruin which are to follow a Proletarian Revolution. The late learned Counsel for the Prosecution took great pains in painting this background in as horrid colours as he could.

Entrenched behind formidable military equipments costing fifty crores of rupees every year, armed with penal codes and ordinances, it is a child's play for Imperialism to start cases under Section 121 A and crush the alleged "conspirators" with

ease. But the bare machinery of law and class justice is not enough. Imperialism must have recourse to skilful and lying propaganda against the alleged conspirators and their principles and try to distort them in the eyes of the public. There never has been a case in the history of the so-called political "crime" in this country in which such stupendous and mischievous propaganda has been carried on by the prosecution with a view to discredit and misrepresent the accused and the principles they stand for.

But all this was necessary for the preservation to the Holy Order of the Commonwealth of Free Nations, namely the British Empire. Why was it necessary to create this background of Red Terror? Why was it necessary for the late learned Crown Counsel to paint before the assessors and the public his own imaginary horrid picture of the Russian Revolution? The answer is quite simple—to distort and belittle its achievements. Why was it necessary to bring on record books and pamphlets which are quite academic?

For a very simple reason that the ruling class all over the world is mightily afraid of a revolution of the toiling masses. They know full well that the growing instability of the capitalist order of society is making such a revolution imminent and possible. Such a revolution has already been successful in Russia, one sixth of the world no longer groans under the yoke of Capitalism. The workers of the rest of the Capitalist countries have this glowing example of Russia before them. The toiling millions of the oppressed and backward nations of the world see a ray of hope in this example. The revolutionary experience of the working class and the peasantry of Russia is the common heritage of the workers of the world. It teaches them methods and tactics of dealing with their oppressors—of ushering in an era of a new society. These methods and tactics have the support of historical experience behind them. They have proved dangerous to Imperialism in the past; they will also do so in the future. It is not enough to crush the few individuals who have taken lead in inaugurating a movement on this basis. It is necessary in the early stages of the movement to discredit these methods and tactics in the eyes of the public, to spread terrifying illusions about them; that is one reason.

D/, 28.10.31

Imperialists and their hired apologists know full well that once the class struggle is unleashed within the rank and file of the nationalist movement, the leadership of the movement will pass into the hands of the oppressed classes who are the bitterest

and the most implacable enemies of Imperialism. It is the historical role of these classes under the leadership of the Communist Party to deal a final and decisive blow to Imperialism, and establish a free and democratic republic of workers and peasants—hence the Communist Movement has to be divorced from the nationalist movement. Did not the late learned Crown Counsel, Mr. Langford James, take great pains to prove that the accused were antinational? Did he not make a great point of the strong criticism which the nationalist leaders received at the hands of the Communists? Did he not make the grand gesture of releasing the real 'Nationalists' among the accused? The whole point in stressing this demarcation between the Nationalists and the Communists was to isolate the latter from the former. Naturally the best way of doing this is to shout that what the Communists are out for is not an "ordered and constitutional National Independence," but chaos, anarchy and Red Terror. Did not the present counsel Mr. Kemp say that we were all against the ordered society? "The present case was one in which the offence, or the intended offence, was against the whole community, and the activities of the accused were fraught with danger not to the Government alone but to the whole to established order of society." This is what Mr. Kemp said while opposing the bail application of Mr. Thengdi in the Allahabad High Court. Here we are depicted as a "Red Peril" to the community as a whole.

You say that we are pledged to overthrow a good Government established by law, that we are out to substitute anarchy for order, and that we are going to achieve this by most gruesome methods which you think are characteristic of the Russian Revolution.

Most certainly we are pledged to overthrow the rule of British Imperialism in India. But we ask, is this rule or is this Government established by law? It is established and maintained by one law, "the law of violence and force." Does it maintain order? Oh! yes, it does maintain order for the Maharajas, Nawabs and Nizams to continue their absolute and autocratic rule—order for the zamindar that he may bleed his tenants white in peace—Order for the Capitalist vulture to fatten on the flesh of the worker—Order for the Imperialist Financial magnates and their hirelings who form top-dogs in this hierarchy of blood-sucking parasites. Now it is quite clear that those who are out to disturb this Holy Order are committing an "offence against the whole community." It is quite clear that their activities are "fraught with danger not to the Government alone but to the whole established order of society."

Every Communist knows what this "established order of society" means to the worker and the peasant. Every Communist considers it his duty to expose these shibboleths in the eyes of the working classes. The task of this exposure is becoming daily easier. "Class Justice" and "White Terror," today more than ever, form the most important weapon in the eyes of the ruling bourgeoisie all over the world. Our defence in a trial like this cannot be anything else but the complete exposure of the practice of bourgeois law, the methods it adopts to make it effective in order to strangle the growing working-class movement. I shall therefore proceed to discuss in detail the conduct of the case which is nothing but an excellent example of the practice of bourgeois law.

Propaganda against the accused.

It is my confirmed opinion that this Prosecution is kept going because it affords an opportunity of carrying on lying propaganda against the principles of Communism in general and creating prejudice in the public minds, by misrepresenting the views and the principles for which the accused persons stand. In this dirty work of carrying on propaganda none else but the Executive Had namely the Viceroy in this country has given a lead. The Prosecution Counsel, the late Mr. Langford James, went on delivering a long sermon ostensibly as the opening speech of the Prosecution case. But actually it was nothing but propaganda against the accused, and when cornered he admitted, "I am afraid that the statement of this case is our propaganda against the accused, but that cannot be helped."

This propagandist address of the late Mr. Langford James covers 120 closely printed foolscap pages. It is therefore now our turn to take notice of all this propaganda and reply to it as much as we can.

This was not all. The opportunity of hitting at our principles was taken by all our enemies, being convinced that we were behind the bars and were not in a position to effectively reply to them. The law of contempt of court prohibits persons from discussing matters pending before a law court. And if so done contempt proceedings are launched. But in this case there are striking illustrations of this law being infringed. Whenever such matters were brought to the notice of the Inquiring Magistrate, either such matters were connived at or attempts were made to justify them. The following are some of the glaring instances of such attempts:—

(1) Viceroy's Chelmsford Club speech on 20th June 1929.

(2) Mr. H. P. Mody's speech (President, Mill-owners Association, Bombay) on 24th June 1929.

(3) N.M. D's article in the Times of India dated 22nd June 1929 on 'Red Menace.'

(4) Reprint of Manchester Guardian's article on "Communism in India, the danger points" in the Indian Press in October 1929.

(5) Government of Bombay note on Labour situation, issued in February 1930.

(6) Times of India's publication of the above note in its issue of 25th February 1930.

(7) Pearson Committee's Report (Report of the Court of Inquiry into the Bombay strike of 1929.)

(8) The Riot Inquiry Committee's Report, 1929.

(9) Khatre ki ghanti, a poster issued by a Rais of Meerut some time in June 1930.

In all these speeches, writings and publications there is nothing but lying propoganda against Communism and Communists. Not only this but some of these have freely commented on the issues and the subject matter of the case, prejudicing the case of the accused. I shall try to show this by quoting from these publications mentioned above. Let us take each item.

The then Viceroy Lord Irwin after having enjoyed a very sumptuous dinner at the Chelmsford Club delivered a speech on 20th June 1929 just a week after the Magisterial Inquiry in this case had begun. He was defending the Government policy in instituting this prosecution. Among other things he had stated that "His Government was convinced with the evidence that they had before them that the accused had violated the law of the land." In this country it is quite plain that the Judiciary and the Executive work hand in hand. And when the highest Executive functionary, the Viceroy, makes such an irresponsible statement as above, then is it not a clear hint to the Magistrate or the I.C.S. Judge "Well; Mr. so and so, I the Viceroy am satisfied with the evidence and you Mr. Magistrate hang them." This is the clear meaning of the Viceroy's above statement. The Magistrate in the Lower Court has carried out the orders faithfully and it is your Honour's turn now to sentence us. And I have not the slightest doubt that, evidence or no evidence, this Court is going to carry out the orders.

When the Magistrate's attention was drawn to the speech of the Simla God he in his characteristic way said, "I have read the Viceroy's speech very carefully and His Excellency has not expressed any opinion whatever." Of course nobody expected anything more than this from the faithful civil servant of British Imperialism. How could he say that his master had committed an act which would amount to contempt of Court? This is a striking instant of defending an act which infringes the law, which is made and maintained every day by the same Government.

Now let us turn to the speech of Mr. Mody, the then President of the Mill-owners' Association and now one of the Round Tablers. In his speech on 20th June, 1929 he made pointed reference to our activities the G.K.U., which were made the subject matter in this case and any reference to them would come under the law of contempt of court. But the learned Magistrate being the representative of the Imperialist Government, which is of course partial to the Capitalists wanted to shield Mr. Mody and his like. He asked, "Apart from the question of jurisdiction, how can I stop any and every person from carrying on anti-Communist propaganda?" The foregoing question of the Magistrate is very significant. The truth is quite simple. The learned Magistrate meant to convey that he could allow anti-Communist propaganda, because the whole trial was instituted for that purpose, apart from getting certain persons convicted. And if Mr. Mody was assisting in that noble purpose, the law did not and could not prevent him from doing it. Mr. Mody and company, whose plans of reducing the worker's wages by introducing the rationalisation scheme had been foiled in 1928, were mightily pleased with the Government for arresting and putting us in prison. It has already been pointed out by Comrade Spratt that this was a strike-breaking prosecution. The cotton kings of Bombay, of whom Mr. Mody was the head, were secretly plotting for another offensive with a view to achieve the object of worker's wagecut. This object could not be fulfilled because the workers had determinedly put up a fight, brought into being an awe-inspiring organisation, namely the G.K.U., with an unprecedented membership of over 70,000, with a conscious working-class leadership ever alert. These were the impediments in the way of the blood-sucking monsters such as Sassoon, Mody and company. They were therefore glad at our arrest and were not slow in seizing the opportunity to carry on propaganda against Communists as the Red menace. Imperialism wanted such propaganda, Capitalism was in need of it in order to crush the growing working-class movement. This is therefore the reason why the Magistrate was conniving at the illegal act of Mody and company. That this is a

strike-breaking prosecution is proved by the following Press quotation from the pro-Imperialist conservative organ, the 'Evening News' of London. This paper cannot be charged with pro-Communist sympathies. It wrote in its issue of 20th March 1929 that "it is understood that the arrest of the Union leaders was taken preparatory to the publication of the report of the Fawcett Committee which was appointed to inquire into the Labour disputes.

"By the terms of the settlement of the long drawn out Bombay Textile strike last year, it was left to this Government Committee to decide on the issues at stake. There was every likelihood that the workers would embark on a new strike if the award went against them.

"The Committee is due to report now and it is widely said that it will reject the workers' demand."

Consequently the significance of the Government's "preparatory action" is easily understood."

Now as we know that these pro-Imperialist papers are always well informed of the Government moves and intentions. Who will therefore have the courage to deny that this is a strike-breaking prosecution as maintained by us in view of the very frank quotation given above ?

Coming to the Guardian's article in the Indian Press, two of the accused made an application to the Allahabad High Court in order to institute contempt proceedings against such papers as had published the said article which was a clear case for contempt; the whole article sounds exactly like the Opening Address of late Mr. Langford James. The author while writing that article all along had in his mind the Meerut Case and it was apparently written with a view to justify this prosecution, against which a great storm of protest was being raised in England. The article was headed "Communism in India—its danger points"; the effect of such an article would be to prejudice the minds of the public from amongst whom our assessors jurors were to be selected. Any man who reads this article was bound to be prejudiced. I shall quote one or two passages for illustrating my point. "Elsewhere, where there is no big concentration of Labour, there has been little or no evidence shown of Communist influence, and such trade disputes as there may have been have arisen from the usual causes. But in Bombay, Calcutta and Jamshedpur the hand of the Communists is very evident in the industrial disputes which have taken place in the recent months. Strikes have started for no sufficient reasons, and have been

carried on by means of intimidation of willing workers, long after there could be any shadow of economic or other justification for refusing to go back to work. Strikes have been organised, led and where possible supplied from funds from undisguised Communist sources to carry on what is usually called now-a-days the war against Capitalism. The record of Bombay for months past is a striking example of the grave dangers and colossal economic harm to India which can flow from the work of the Communist agents.

"The same agency has been at work amongst the employees of certain of the big Railway Companies, and within the past two years strikes accompanied in most if not all cases by acts of sabotage, have taken place, largely, there is no reason to doubt, as the result of Communist instigation. The South Indian Railway and the East Indian Railway have both been the scenes of prolonged strikes of a kind and accompanied by incidents new to Indian industrial disputes. Indeed the same can be said of the recent strikes in Bombay, Calcutta and Jamshedpur. The crimes which have been their accompaniment represent something absolutely new in India and, it is to be hoped, something transient."

Now the statement I have made above that the whole article sounded like the Opening Address of the late Mr. James is justified by the above passage. His Address too runs in the same strain as this article in the 'Manchester Guardian'. One does not know whether this article was inspired by the Prosecution as a justification of their mistakes in making this trial unimaginably lengthy.

However we thought that this was a clear case of contempt of Court and made an application to our Hon'ble High Court at Allahabad. This application along with the transfer application was disposed of ex parte by Mr. Justice Boys—by the way I may remark that this Hon'ble High Court will rank very high in dispensing ex-parte justice—Mr. Justice Boys in his judgment remarked that "The real thing I have to consider is whether there is anything in this article which could conceivably influence the Magistrate not merely against Communism generally but against any of those particular accused. I can not conceive that he could possibly be so influenced by anything said in this article."

Whether the Magistrate was influenced or not is quite clear from his very illuminating Committal Order. It is very hard to assess the exact amount of influence this particular article had created in his mind but it had played its due part, and about this I have not the slightest doubt. Whenever the interests of the accused have been involved the judicial machinery of Imperialism

has been bent down and has stoutly frustrated all plans of the accused. As against this whenever the interests of the Prosecution were involved heaven and earth have been moved; a very effective action is taken and the offender is brought to book. On this particular subject of the contempt proceedings the case brought against Mr. Wilson, the then editor of the 'Pioneer,' is an instance which amply illustrates my grievance. I shall of course deal with this later on. Any way the complaint against the 'Manchester Guardian' article had the same fate as that of the protest against the Viceroy's speech against us.

I shall now draw the attention of the Court to the propaganda which was the plainest infringement of the contempt of court law by the Government and their semi-official organs such as the 'Times of India'. Some time in the month of February, 1930, the Government of Bombay issued a note on the labour situation in Bombay city, copies of this note were distributed broadcast to the press, the sole purpose being to prejudice public opinion against the growing working-class movement, and incidentally also to prejudice the public against the activities of the accused in this case. Your honour will find from the following quotation the objects mentioned are as clear as day light. "The calling of a general strike in April 1929 with the prospect of a long stoppage of work supervening upon the disastrous strike of the previous year greatly perturbed public opinion, the abstention of Bombay Textile Labour Union threw into relief the activities of the Girni Kamgar Union, more particularly as several of the leaders of that Union had been arrested in connection with the Meerut Case, while the public felt that the communal riots in the early parts of the year had been fomented by the activities of these same leaders in stirring animosity against the Pathans.....the object of the leaders of the Girni Kamgar Union in calling the strike was not to fight the cause of the workers and of Trade Unionism, but was in support of Communist doctrines."

The same note in the appendix B further said "Communism entered the Labour Movement in Bombay city in January 1927 when a group of National Congress formed a Workers' and Peasants' Party, one of whose objects was "to promote the organisation of Trade Unions and to rest them from their alien control." In May 1927 they started a paper called the 'Kranti' (Revolution) which ceased publication at the end of the year owing to financial difficulties, but was revived during the 1928 Strike, and was prominent in 1929. Towards the end of 1927 the leaders of the Workers' and Peasants' Party penetrated the existing labour organisations and a number succeeded in getting elected as office

bearers of the A.I.T.U.C..... On 23rd May 1928 they registered the Girni Kamgar Union, and it was soon apparent that their object was the destruction of Capital and the establishment of a Labour Raj. They endeavoured to organise Railway Transport and Municipal workers etc. and formed Unions with members of the W. P. P. on their Executive."

Here I desire to state that my object in giving the above quotation is not to show that what has been stated is wrong but to tear the mask off the bourgeois justice and show it in its clear nakedness, how sham that justice is. Five of us made an application to the Allahabad High Court praying that notice be issued, to the editor, printer and publisher of the 'Times of India' to show cause why they should not be convicted for contempt of Court, when we found the said note fully published with flaring headlines in that paper of 25th February 1930. When this application came for consideration before Mr. Justice Sulaiman, while holding that there was contempt in one of the passages, he rejected our application. This is what Mr. Justice Sulaiman said in his order. His Lordship held that "two of the passages could not be considered to relate necessarily to any of the accused in the case, the third however was slightly more definite." On this point His Lordship said, "The reference in the note to the leaders of the Union who were arrested in connection with the Meerut case as having fomented the riots was not proper, as the Meerut Case was still proceeding. Matter published in a newspaper relating to the past life of an accused or to his antecedent character particularly if it suggests an offence similar to that with which he is charged, is contempt of Court, as it must therefore interfere with the fair trial of that charge. The reproduction of this passage, therefore, amounts to contempt of court."

Having come to this conclusion and even thinking it necessary to warn the editor, printer and publisher of this paper, as this Hon'ble Judge did, he refused to issue notice as asked for in our application. Why so? Because it is bourgeois justice. Whenever they want to condone an offence they can find any excuse to do so.

The Riots Inquiry Committee's Report made after the Magisterial Inquiry in this case, publishes in "Appendix B" extracts from speeches exhibited as evidence against us in this case. The passages are almost the same as were read in this Court by the Crown Counsel. I do not know what is the purpose behind this Governmental publicity if it was not meant for propaganda to prejudice the public mind against us. And because this propaganda was in favour of the Prosecution they kept their eyes closed to this kind of propaganda carried on against the accused. "The Indian

Year Book for 1930' published by the 'Times of India' also contains an article entitled "The growth of the Labour Problem". In spite of the warning of the Allahabad High Court to the printer and publisher of the 'Times of India' Press, this article contains passages which in my opinion clearly amount to contempt of court. But because we have got disillusioning experience of the Allahabad High Court in regard to the dispensation of justice, we did not take the trouble of taking action against it. I shall quote some passages from this article which is a clear case of contempt of court. It runs as follows:—"When the so-called Labour group of Indian National Congress failed to obtain acceptance of their ideas by the Congress, they formed in January 1927 a Workers' and Peasants' Party one of whose object was to promote the organisation of Trade Unions and wrest them from their alien control. Communist emissaries were sent out to India by the Third International to further the war against Imperialism, the destruction of Capital and the creed of revolution.

Regarding one of the alleged conspiratorial organisations in this case 'The Year Book' article has already made a definite statement which is as follows:—"The Communist group was able to capture the Indian Trade Union Congress at the Eleventh Session held in Nagpur and to force the moderate elements consisting of Messrs. N. M. Joshi, Dewan Chaman Lal, B. Shiva Rao, V. V. Giri, R. R. Bakhale etc. To secede from the Congress on that Body passing resolutions of boycotting the Royal Commission on Labour and International Labour Conference, and appointing the Workers' Welfare League, a Communist organisation in England as their agent for Great Britain etc. Now this Court is aware that this organisation is one of the alleged conspiratorial organisations and until this Court comes to a finding after taking into due consideration all the evidence whether this is a conspiratorial and Communist organisation or not, such a statement would clearly amount to contempt of court.

The Prosecution launched proceedings for contempt of Court against Mr. Wilson of the 'Pioneer' for writing a very mild note regarding the Labour Research Department—one of the alleged conspiratorial organisations in this case. It also succeeded in its object and Mr. Wilson was brought to book and had to apologise in the High Court in addition to the payment of Rs 600/--as costs. But if the Defence had brought a suit against the publishers of this 'Year Book', the Defence would have failed in their object. The previous experience confirms this belief.

The only case in which the Defence succeeded was the leaflet entitled "Khatre ki ghanti" which was admitted by the High Court

as a clear case of contempt and its author and publisher were ordered to pay the costs. The reason why we succeeded in this case is I suppose, that the parties against whom the case was brought were neither the Governmental agencies nor were they very influential persons whom the class justice that prevails under Imperialism primarily protects.

The Prosecution case for contempt against Mr. Wilson to which I have already alluded in brief is a very interesting affair. This case arose out of two of the articles written by Mr. Wilson in the 'Pioneer'. The principal article to which the Prosecution took exception was one criticising in a humorous manner the evidence given by that white Russian Mr. Derojinsky in this Court. The life history, is brought out in the cross examination of this individual, is such a strange one, that there was absolutely no wonder that Mr. Wilson should write an article slightly criticising it in a half humorous manner. But how could the Prosecution tolerate this criticism of their faithful dog who had so loyally assisted them? Poor Mr. Wilson had to yield before all powerful judiciary and was obliged to choose between the prison and an abject apology. He therefore chose the latter.

Another very striking point about these proceedings was that the whole judicial machinery functioned so well in favour of the Prosecution. Whenever any of the accused put in any such applications they were either disposed of on some flimsy technical defect or in the absence of this they were disposed of ex parte without giving any hearing to the applicant's point of view. In the case of the contempt proceedings against Mr. Wilson, the Prosecution being the applicant party, every proper opportunity and facilities were afforded to them while the same were always denied to the accused.

Mr. Derojinsky, by the way, I may mention, has exploited these contempt proceedings for money making. He instituted civil proceedings against Mr. Wilson and the proprietors of the 'Pioneer' for defamation of character—if this individual has any character. The proprietors of the 'Pioneer,' having admitted that there was defamation in the article complained of by Derojinsky, arrived at a settlement with him by making a payment of Rs 2500/- as against the original suit of one lac. One wonders whether the character of the C. I. D. hireling is worth anything. Anyway the money making business of this Imperialist henchman is beyond doubt thriving. This is the offshoot of the contempt proceedings against Mr. Wilson.

Here then ends my story of the most lying propaganda carried on both by official and non-official agencies and which could have easily been made the issue for instituting proceedings against these agencies under the law of contempt of court. But which court can think of convicting the Viceroy of India and put him into prison for violating the law of the land excepting the revolutionary Tribunal of the workers and peasants?

Practice of Bourgeois Law.

After having pointed out the most glaring examples of the propaganda indulged in by the Executive Government and the most influential members of the Indian bourgeoisie against us, I now propose to deal with the methods of practice of their law. There are ample cases where—from it can be established that the very agents of Government have exceeded the limits of their own law while administering it. But as we know beyond doubt the law and the legal machinery exists and are intended to be used by the ruling class for the purpose of suppressing the exploited class. It is so even in Britain itself in spite of the pretence of fairness and impartiality, Professor H. J. Laski summarises our criticism thus (P1782 pages 134—135). "All men are equal before the courts; but they can not enforce their equality save by the possession of wealth they do not possess. The humble tenant who seeks redress against his landlord, the seryant girl who is dismissed without wages or character by her mistress, the workman injured in the course of employment and refused compensation by an employer who argues negligence on his part, all these are but instances of inequality before the law which gives the lie to the democratic thesis of equality. The hierarchy of courts, moreover, may well swallow in the costs of appeal even the pitiful re-dress, the workers have been able to secure. The very fact that special legal institutions have been created which seek to alter the balance, the present order maintains, is itself proof that the democratic claim is inadequate."

The same view is taken by no less considerable authorities than the Webb's (History of Trade Unionism, pages 625-26). In their account of the Osborne Judgment they refer to "the bias and prejudice, the animous and partiality, doubtless unconscious, of the Judges themselves.....the undisguised glee with which this grave miscarriage of justice was received by the governing classes," and state:—"What lay behind the Osborne Judgment was determination to exclude the influence of the workmen's combinations from the political field."

It is clear from these authorities the class character of the law and the judiciary,

In this country the class character of the law is shown by its operation upon the peasantry. Especially in the zamindari provinces, the jails are full of poor peasants and landless labourers whose crime is nothing but poverty. While fighting against their appalling poverty these men happened to commit minor offences which are punished with tremendous severity. Sections 109 and 110 simply run amok, and these sections are so frequently used against such persons in the villages who are likely to organise revolt against the mahajans and landlords, who are day and night sucking the blood of these poor peasants. In the Meerut Jail itself we find hundreds of cases of these poor peasants being thrust into jail under these sections. This is how the legal machinery works in its day-to-day operations in its ordinary field. But when we come to examine its operation in political offences the balance is invariably weighed in favour of the ruling class. Laski says approvingly (P1782 page 127):-

D/ 29. 10. 31

"In Capitalist States the laws of treason and sedition for example are, from a Communist standpoint, so defined as to make rebellion and urgent criticism of the possessing classes difficult to the point of impossibility."

This is the case with the law in Great Britain. As is well known, the law in India with regard to political offences is more drastic. The famous 12 Communists Trial in England is an instance in point. The highest punishment given in that case to the Communists never exceeded one year, whereas we in this case are threatened with transportation for life. Let us leave aside as needing no comment such "lawless laws", as they have been called, as regulations 3 of 1818, the Bengal Criminal Law Amendment Act of 1925; and 1930; such pieces of frank class Legislation as the Trades Disputes Act of 1929, the Goondas Acts, and the Public Safety Ordinance and various other Ordinances put in force from time to time by the Viceroy. What are they? They are the open expressions of Imperialist dictatorship. I am concerned with the regular law and its operation.

Section 124 A I. P. C. is perhaps the most striking example whereby under the cover of the law the ruling class can effectively put down the expression of any opinion they like. This section is so often used and in such a flagrant manner that even the bourgeois politicians have expressed their opposition to it very often. Its legally technical defects are very often discussed in the Press with which I am not concerned. The bourgeois Liberals talk of "freedom of Press" and "freedom of expression" and grandiose phrases like these. The wretched loyalists claim that

the British rule is the just rule in India and they foolishly cling to this belief. But the existence of the Criminal Procedure Code, Indian Penal Code and their all prevailing operation is nothing but the sharpest weapon in the hands of the British Imperialists to maintain their rule in India. A few years ago, mere utterance of the word "Swaraj" could become a crime under section 124 A. A mere academic advocacy of complete Independence came under this section. Maulana Hasrat Mohani was punished under this section merely because he moved a resolution of complete Independence in the Ahmedabad Congress in the year 1919. A Calcutta Magistrate held "that shouting the slogan Down with Imperialism" was sedition and came under this section.

There is already a Bill by Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer in the Legislative Assembly to amend certain provisions of the Indian Penal Code and particularly section 124 A. This section has been on the Statute-book since 1898 when it was first passed in the Legislative Council, as it then constituted, in its present form. What havoc this section has worked needs no further elucidation. The bourgeois nationalists therefore would quite naturally demand the amendment of this section, and would be satisfied with it. Mr. Ranga Iyer's palliative efforts might please these nationalists; but the workers and peasants of India, whom British Imperialism wants to hold in bondage for ever, cannot be satisfied with these palliative methods of amending here and patching there; it will never satisfy them. From their point of view what is wanted is the complete annihilation of Imperialism and not the amendments of its weapons here and there.

Almost equally useful to Imperialism is section 121 A I.P.C. This most extraordinary provision was added to the Code in 1908. Its most striking feature is the provision in contrast with the British law of treason, that no "overt act" or act which is itself of a criminal character need be committed. This of course gives the very widest possibility of repression. The remarks of the Magistrate (Committal Order, page 9) make perfectly clear his belief that mere membership of any organisation having as its object complete Independence, and contemplating any degree of compulsion in its attainment, is punishable under this section. And the late Mr. Langford James went a step further and stated in his address that even formal membership too is unnecessary, mere "association" is more than enough.

Section 121 A I. P. C. has been used in many cases other than the present one. Particularly notable are those in which the 'Muhajirins' coming back from their visits to Soviet Russia, have

been involved. In all these cases there was not a scrap of evidence except that they had been to Russia. In almost all cases they were arrested on crossing the frontier so that they had no chance to do anything; and yet most of them were sentenced. Two in 1920 denied that they were Communists, and still they were sentenced to one and three years respectively. Eight were sentenced to one and three years in the same manner in 1923. (P. 1375 Kranti dated 17. 9. 27). The case of Comrade Fazl Elahi under this very section occurred. It was exactly parallel to the other cases of the "Muhajirins". The only fault committed by him was that he visited Soviet Russia and returned to India. The proportion of the sentence however this time increased and he was given five years' rigorous imprisonment. In Great Britain people can go to Russia, return from there, write books praising the Soviet system quite freely and openly, whereas in India it is considered a heinous offence. Recently Bernard Shaw paid a visit to Russia, who is at present delivering lectures in England and proposes to write a play extolling the Soviet regime. In India Shaw's fate would have been several years' Jail.

The possibilities of this section are further illustrated by the Cawnpore Case of 1924. The evidence of association in that case was of the flimsiest character and practically no evidence at all of steps to carry out the intentions of the supposed conspiracy was sufficient to clap four men into prison for four years each. It was most definitely a case of prosecution for opinion pure and simple.

Section 121 A is further aided by section 10 of the Evidence Act in its deadly efficacy. This enables to be used against any individual on a charge of conspiracy, evidence of the acts or expressions of opinion of his associates which may have been committed without his approval or even his knowledge. This section seems to be very widely interpreted. Evidence of acts committed before association commences, and after it ceases, is admissible. There need be no direct proof of association—mere "circumstances raising the presumption of a common concerted plan" are enough to prove conspiracy.

With such armoury of legal weapons, repression should be child's play. Yet still further steps have to be taken to implicate and get the offenders punished legally and constitutionally for breaches of the law. Such are exemplified by the conduct of this case.

Fair treatment in the Meerut Case.

On various occasions and at different places statements were made by the public Prosecutor, by the Government member in ex-Secretary of State from the platform of the Assembly and by the

House of Commons that the accused in the Meerut Case are accorded "fair treatment", given all facilities for defence, provided with lawyers etc. It is therefore necessary here to examine the conduct of this case right from the beginning and show what these fair treatments meant and give a direct lie to all the statements made from time to time. I should however make it quite clear as I have done before, that I am not lodging a complaint. We have no illusions about the justice under Imperialism or the possibility of justice between the ruling class and an oppressed class in any circumstances. We try to take advantage of such provisions of the law as seem useful to accused persons, in the full knowledge that any facilities etc. Which we may gain thereby will be in the end of no use to us. It has been no surprise to us that the most important instances of these facilities have been, by one means or another, denied to us. But by doing this we are assisting in the more complete exposure of the class character of justice. That is our whole purpose and justification.

I have already pointed out the late Viceroy's utterances in India before; the same Viceroy while in England is reported to have said, "If the British Government interfered in this case, both he and others of the Civil Service would resign." (Daily Worker 30th June, 1930).

After this threat would we for a moment hope to get acquittal from this case in this Court?

Venue of the Trial

The first step the Prosecution took in their campaign against the accused was the selection of Meerut as the place of trial. The grounds for holding the trial at Meerut are the feeblest and this we have pointed out in our innumerable applications on this subject both to the Magistrate, the High Court and this Court. The Prosecution and the Magistrate in order to justify themselves have had to magnify out of all proportion the significance of the Conference which is said to have taken place at Meerut. The places where the major parts of the activities which figure in the evidence occurred, are Bombay and Calcutta. The alleged activity which took place at Meerut was relatively of the slightest importance. Only one of the accused lives at Meerut whose statement is quite clear with regard to his political faith. Only eight of the accused are alleged to have visited Meerut while the rest had only read of it in Geography books. According to the Prosecution evidence almost all the accused have visited Calcutta or Bombay or both "in pursuance of the conspiracy."

The objects of the Prosecution in selecting Meerut, where the same as those which prompted the selection of Cawnpore—again on the very slightest ground—in 1924. It isolated us from the movement with which we were connected, and separated us from our friends and relatives. It increased greatly the difficulties and expenses of obtaining legal assistance. It brought us under the most subservient and illiberal judiciary in the country. And it deprived us of a trial by jury. It created great difficulties in our way in obtaining the necessary literature for our defence. The Prosecution have been able to put forward in justification of their choice only the fact that Meerut is a "central place."

We went through the formality of applying for transfer of the case, first to a Presidency town like Bombay or Calcutta. Under S. 527 of the Criminal Procedure Code the Governor General in Council has Power to do this. He refused to do this expressing "regret" and assuring us that the matter had had "full consideration." It may be noticed that the Labour Secretary of State for India was asked to do this in the House of Commons on the 15th of July 1929. "No reply was given." (Pioneer, 18/7/1929).

We next applied to the High Court at Allahabad in July 1929 for a transfer for the Magistrate's Inquiry. The Chief Justice as usual refused the application.

Later, on 19/10/1929 when the Magistrate's Inquiry was proceeding, we had occasion to apply for transfer of the case. In accordance with S. 536 (8) Criminal Procedure Code proceedings at once stopped to give us reasonable time to move the High Court. We sent our application by post, but before it came up for consideration, the Prosecution had gone before the High Court and obtained an ex parte judgment, that we had abused the privileges extended to us under this section and that the case must proceed at once. We protested against this order, and applied that the case should stop until our previous application for transfer came up for decision. This application was refused. Thus a clear provision of S. 526 (8) was disobeyed by the High Court. Even in this petty matter the judiciary did not trouble to observe its own law.

We next applied to the High Court under sections 526 and 267 of the Criminal Procedure Code for transfer of the case to Allahabad for High Court Sessions Trial and for jury. It is very interesting to note here another instance of predecision of the issue by the Executive Government. At the time when our application was before the High Court, Committal Order was passed on 10th January 1930. On Monday 13/1/1930, before the High Court's decision had been made, the extraordinary Gazette issued by the

Government of U. P. announced your Honour's appointment as Additional Sessions Judge of Meerut for trying this case.

Thus all our efforts for transfer were defeated and the scene of the trial remained at Meerut.

While I am on this subject of transfer of the case let me say a few words about the latest transfer application made by comrade Nimbkar to the Allahabad High Court against your Honour's remarks about Mr. Nimbkar's deserts. Although this application has been decided against him still I maintain that comrade Nimbkar was not wrong in making this application. It was argued on behalf of comrade Nimbkar that your Honour had made up your mind in the case and that you were prejudiced. Although the High Court Judge hearing this application did not accept the argument, still every Communist accused inside the dock very well knows that this Court is prejudiced. I may say that there is nothing surprising in it also. Because the Prosecution's propaganda was meant for creating such prejudice. I shall be really surprised to know that this Court is not prejudiced. I do not think that either comrade Nimbkar or any one of the accused ever expected the application to succeed. It has only further the exposed judiciary and what efforts even a judge has to make in order to get out of an awkward position. We consider this a great success, greater than the success of the application itself.

Then Sir, I come to another important matter which has always created insurmountable difficulties in our defence. It also exposes how hollow the claim of fairness to the accused in this case is. It is the question of interception of our correspondence.

It is the accepted practice that the correspondence of the accused persons should not be tampered with and especially the contents of the correspondence of the accused should not be known to the Prosecution. We however had no illusions as to how this principle has been observed in our own case; and we have from time to time charged the prosecution with systematically examining our correspondence. They of course have always denied the charge with every symptom of virtuous indignation. But the evidence of Mr. Abdul Aziz, Ex-Jailor of Meerut Jail (P.W. 138), and Lieutenant Colonel M.A. Rahman, Ex-Superintendent of the Jail (P.W. 133), clearly show that our correspondence has been passed to the Prosecution for its examination.

In addition to the evidence of these two witnesses I am showing to the Court now two covers addressed to comrade Adhikari. And these were certain books sent from Germany for

our defence. Your Honour will find on the cover a remark made by Mr. Coghill, the Joint Magistrate, "To Mr. Horton for examination."

Mr. Horton was in charge of the Prosecution from the beginning of the case and I do not see any earthly reason why our papers should go to this Police officer who was in charge of the Prosecution? The only valid reason for such an action is to warn Prosecution beforehand and keep them well informed of our plan of defence. This procedure of intercepting our correspondence both private and pertaining to our defence has been going on uninterrupted up till today. The only change being that instead of Mr. Horton Mr. Nabi examines them.

In this connection I propose to recall another incident which occurred very recently. It was relating to the letters of Messrs. Bradley and Desai. These foreign mail letters addressed to Mr. Fenner Brockway M.P., came for examination as usual and were directly sent to the post office from the Garden House. The postal clerk who was probably unaware of the instructions, wrote on the registered postal receipts the words "Garden House" and thus the whole scandal once again came out. The matter was brought to your Honour's notice. The Prosecution as usual denied it. Still the truth is there; and the particular evidence I have brought to the notice of the Court plainly exposes the shameful methods utilised.

Even letters marked "legal opinion" addressed to comrade Muzaffar Ahmad were opened by the Jail authorities, shown to the Prosecution and then delivered to him. Under these circumstances is it not the height of shamelessness to say that we are given "fair opportunities for defence?"

Another example of the "fair opportunities" for defence is the refusal to allow us to call foreign witnesses. At the end of the Magistrate's Inquiry some of the accused put in a list of defence witnesses which included a number of persons residing in Europe, mainly in England and one in Australia and in Indian States. During the course of the Sessions Trial an application was made that these persons be summoned by the District Magistrate to come to India. The District Magistrate refused to issue summonses on the ground that he had no jurisdiction to do so. In consequence an application was made to the Governor General on 22/3/1930 that the authorities at Meerut be directed to issue summonses to some of these foreign witnesses; that provision be made that they be allowed to enter the country and leave again without being arrested; and that while in India they should not be

subjected to annoyance by the Police etc. These precautions were necessary because some of these persons had been named by the Prosecution as "co-conspirators."

The Government replied on the 17/5/1930 that (1) they had no power to summon witnesses from outside India or to direct that they be so summoned; (2) that if such persons wish to come as witnesses the Government of India could not give any undertaking that passports would be granted to them, or, if they enter India, they would not be arrested "if they had done anything which rendered them liable under the law."

The same accused then applied to your Honour on 30/5/1930 with the same result. Your Honour merely reechoed the desire of the Government of India and rejected that application. The refusal of summoning foreign witnesses for the defence, when the Prosecution summoned eight Scotland Yard witnesses who remained in India for well nigh four months, was unjust enough. Thousands of rupees were spent on their enjoyment in India, their travels and luxury; but when the question came for calling the foreign witnesses for defence Government at once brought forth the excuse of jurisdiction. How was the difficulty overcome in the case of the Prosecution, when witnesses from England and French India were called? Our case has been considerably prejudiced by the Government's refusal to summon these foreign witnesses. Is this an instance of "fair opportunities" for defence?

Speaking for myself I wanted one of these witnesses, namely Mr. J. Ryan, to come and give evidence. The Prosecution has alleged that he made a speech on Soviet Russia at the Jinnah Hall when I was present. (P. W. 10/10 B. R. Mankar). It is also alleged that Mr. Ryan was connected with the Pan-Pacific Trade Union Secretariat. According to me Mr. Mankar's report of Mr. Ryan's speech is incorrect and if Mr. Ryan had been called as a witness, it would have been possible to prove the incorrectness of the said speech (P1691). So also it was he who would have deposed as to what the Pan-Pacific Trade Union Secretariat was, and his evidence would have helped us as well as the Court to determine whether the Pan-Pacific Trade Union Secretariat was a conspiratorial body. It can therefore reasonably be said that by not allowing these witnesses, the Government as well as your Honour has helped the prosecution considerably. Had these witnesses been allowed to appear before this Court some of the ridiculous theories, wild gossips about several organisations and the like evidence of the Prosecution would have been torn to pieces.

Another trick the Prosecution played in the very beginning was this; they very naturally anticipated that some of the prominent individuals abroad figuring in the evidence would be called as defence witnesses. Therefore, they conspired to put in their names in the co-conspirators' list. The idea behind this was to frighten the Government in great Britain that in case anyone of these individuals were to come to India the Indian Empire would be lost to them. The conspiracy succeeded beyond doubt. Comrade J.R. Campbell's case is a typical instance of it.

It had been arranged that an English lawyer should be sent by National Meerut Prisoners' Defence Committee in England, for the defence of the accused, and he should be accompanied by comrade J.R. Campbell of the C.P.G.B. in the capacity of a political adviser. Comrade J.R. Campbell applied for a passport after an agreement had been arrived at with the India Office, but after some delay comrade Campbell was informed that a passport could not be issued. Mr. Wedgwood Benn then Secretary of State for India had reconsidered the matter and decided not to allow him a passport. What could have actually happened which made Mr. Benn to reconsider his decision?

We have all along maintained that this case is nothing but propaganda against the accused. The opening Address of the Crown Counsel received wide publicity in the press. The sole purpose of the lengthy dissertation was nothing but a campaign against the accused, the movement in India with which they were connected, the international Labour Movement and especially against the U. S. S. R. Many other opportunities such as bail applications were used by them for their propagandist activities. Mr. Kemp for instance in the Allahabad High Court once said "it was not a political case of the type which evoked the sympathy of the people, and there was no question whatsoever that even the most humble apology would be accepted by the Government. The accused in this case were of an entirely different class and it was the case for the Prosecution that they were dangerous not only to the Government but to the community—to his friend Mr. Khwaja, (the lawyer appearing for Mr. Thengdi) as much as to everybody else." What is it if not propaganda? I have already shown how propaganda was conducted by all agencies against the accused right from the beginning of this case. I shall now quote an anonymous letter received by Mr. K. F. Nariman of Bombay who in the early stages of this case rendered us some legal aid. This letter is a sound proof of the effectiveness of all this propaganda carried on against the accused. The said letter was published in the 'Bombay Chronicle of 24-6-1929. "Try to improve or commit suicide" is a gentle hint conveyed to Mr. Nariman by the writer of an anonymous

letter which is addressed in the following way: "Mr. K.F. Nariman, defence pleader of murderers and revolutionaries of Meerut,"

"You are a man of talent, you are not using it properly. You a staunch Parsi. Now it seems you have gone to the other extreme. As a Parsi you must be or ought to be loyal to the King. Now you are assisting the Communists, who have made a plot to overthrow the Government, who have committed two Parsi murders. According to a proverb "fools rush in where angels fear to tread." Why not Nehrus and Malaviya help those murderers? You are disgracing the Parsi community. You are not a hero but you are a disgrace. You must not convert yourself into Kafirism, etc. etc."

The whole purpose in quoting the above letter is to show how the public mind reacts to the sufficient amount of propoganda when made with the deliberate object of creating prejudice. The above letter is a visible fruit of the late Mr. Langford James' Address which was even condemned by the Labour Party organ, the "Daily Herald" of London. It criticised the speech in its issue of 28-6-1929 in the following manner: "It had been promised that Mr. Langford James, the special Crown Prosecutor, would unfold an "amazing tale."

"He did, on the first day, fulfill that promise though scarcely perhaps in accordance with expectation. His Opening Speech was an astounding performance. He appears to have made no reference to any alleged actions on the part of the accused. Instead he made a political oration, largely consisting of attacks on the Soviet Government."

"That Government he described as "a narrow, cruel, and tyrannous autocracy, masquerading under the false name of popular government." He is reported to have said, "Every member of the Russian Government is pledged to work for the overthrow of his Majesty's Government by any means in his power."

"The propriety of an official prosecutor speaking thus of a foreign Government with which His Majesty's Government is about to renew friendly relations is distinctly open to question."

"Scarcely less improper were what every impartial person cannot but regard as attempts to excite crude prejudice, his declarations that the accused, as Communists, were pledged "ruthlessly to kill those who differ from them," and that they were "anti everything that was decent." He specified the "desecration of churches" but curiously forgot to mention the "nationalisation of women!" The paper further added that "the accused men must be counted

as innocent unless and until they are proved guilty of definite acts of conspiracy; and that they are entitled to strict impartiality and to protection against the endeavours to prejudice their case by an appeal to political bias."

Are we getting this "impartiality" and "protection" in this Court?

D/ 30-10-31

The accused were silenced by the peculiar position they were in in spite of the virulent campaign that was going on. When our time came for a little counter-propaganda, however, by cross-examination of the witnesses in the Sessions Court, the Prosecution suddenly adopted a strict legal frame of mind. Questions put to the witnesses by the accused were characterised as propaganda and were objected to. And your Honour, with and without the prompting from the Prosecution, effectively countered these feeble propagandist efforts of the accused, by disallowing several questions on the convenient doctrine of "irrelevancy" or "inadmissibility."

Question of Bail.

On the question of bail the Judiciary have clearly acted as dutiful servants of the Executive and have carried out the orders of their masters to the letter. Even the High Court is no exception to this rule. During the last 33 or 34 months of our jail life frequent bail applications were made on behalf of the accused. The question of bail was at last finally settled by the Allahabad High Court in the month of June last, by introducing the most vicious principle of "no bail to Communist accused." The legal luminaries regard this as illegal; but what of legality or illegality to British Imperialism? What is convenient to Imperialist class interests, is legal and inconvenient, is illegal. This is the definition of Imperialist legalism. All efforts therefore at getting bail had failed up to the month of April, 1931, barring only one exception of Comrade Ghate who was allowed bail at the time, because he was in a serious danger of losing his life. It is admitted that the courts have discretion to grant bail in such a case as this. But the main legal point relied upon in refusing bail is that it should generally not be granted in cases in which the offences are punishable with transportation for life. As has been pointed out on behalf of the applicants, cases have occurred in Peshawar and in the case of the S.I.R. Conspiracy Case for instance under section 121 A, in which the accused have been released on bail; and none of these cases lasted anything like the length of this case.

It is the common practice to grant bail to persons accused under section 124 A offences under which are also punishable with transportation for life.

It is very interesting to note the pleas put forward by the Prosecution while opposing these applications from time to time, and which were supported by the judicial officers that, if released on bail, some of us should abscond; that our health is not likely to suffer more in jail than outside etc. They were obviously shifts which have had to be resorted to for the purpose of giving some sort of legal cover to Executive orders.

In the month of April last however things changed, and the never-failing judicial machinery gave way. Comrades Hutchinson and Nimbkar, who were refused bail by this Court, approached the Division Bench of the Allahabad High Court and by the sheer force of their arguments secured their release on bail. Mr. Kemp had to admit that there was no avert illegal act committed by the accused in the whole of the case. In his judgment Mr. Justice Mukerjee remarked that:—

“All that therefore they have done is to hold meetings, study the principles of Communism and probably also to make an attempt to disseminate those teachings which are said to be dangerous to the sovereignty of His Majesty. In view of this admission on behalf of the Prosecution it is clear that if there was any offence committed by the applicants in the shape of a conspiracy of a serious nature, the conspiracy has almost been nipped in the bud by the Police.” Further the same judgment said, “It is a pity that the applicants’ applications before the Magistrate’s Court and the Court of the learned Sessions Judge were not granted.”

This judgment of the Division Bench opened up a new chapter for the accused in the matter of bail. Immediately several bail applications were made before this Court; and although ordinarily this Court was bound to grant bail to all the applicants because of the binding effect of the High Court judgment, this Court openly defied it, rejected the majority of the applications, granting bail only to four of them. Your Honour’s very illuminating order dated 7th May, 1931 even went to the length of criticising the knowledge of law of the High Court Judges who composed the Division Bench.

This Court ventured to defy the High Court Judges’ order simply because the Court knew that the Prosecution and the whole Executive authority was behind it. Consequently there was no need to be afraid of the High Court.

The applicants whose applications were rejected approached the High Court in appeal. After considerable dilatory tactics, these applications, going from this Judge to that Judge, finally came up for hearing before the Full Bench on the 25th June, and on the next day, no sooner were the arguments finished than the Full Bench delivered a very surprising judgment within about ten minutes releasing all the non-Communist accused on bail, irrespective of the fact whether they wanted it or not. The Full Bench judgment failed to give any reasons as to why they were refusing bail to the Communist accused; because they thought observing silence was the best course under the circumstances. They however did what the Executive wanted. The fact that they were unable to advance any legal grounds to support the refusal of bail to the Communist accused was very significant. And the unashamed demand of the Prosecution for refusal of bail to the Communists was granted by the Full Bench. Mr. Kemp put this demand in a very expressive language; he said, "The accused were confirmed Communists and to release them on bail would mean a great win for the Communist International." (Pioneer 27th May, 1931). The intervening period of nearly six weeks was made use of thoroughly in bringing the Executive pressure upon the judicial mechanism. The Prosecution were straining every nerve in order to prevent bail being granted to us. And there were adequate reasons for their anxiety. The Division Bench judgment had already punctured their case; if we had been granted bail by the Full Bench the seriousness of the case which they tried to exaggerate, would have appeared in its true nature. And probably the whole case would have crashed like the R. 101. The Prosecution lawyers' legal prestige also had suffered very much by two layman accused appearing personally before the High Court and persuading it to grant bail even when the Prosecution was so ably represented by a counsel of Mr. Kemp's eminence. The Prosecution had also armed itself with heavy ammunition of lengthy affidavit. The result of all this was that the Communist accused continued to be kept in jail as they were before. If the policy adopted is that merely because we are Communists, we are not to be let out on bail, who can then dare deny when we assert that this whole prosecution is a prosecution for political opinions?

The sequel to the bail applications' incident is the successful and unsuccessful attempt at cancellation of bail of Comrades Nimbkar and Hutchinson respectively. The Prosecution did not approve of the continuation of the limited liberty secured by these two comrades. They therefore on flimsy, fabricated and technical grounds applied to the High Court for cancellation of their bail. In the case of Comrade Nimbkar an affidavit was sworn

by the C.I.D. constable in Bombay to the effect that he had made a public speech during his sojourn there. We know the immeasurable capacity of the Police officers in India to tell lies. And I want to say that this affidavit was nothing but a fabrication. Several affidavits sworn by responsible persons on behalf of Comrade Nimbkar were however not believed in by the High Court and entire reliance was placed on the C.I.D. constable's affidavit by the Judge who ultimately cancelled Comrade Nimbkar's bail. Comrade Hutchinson was merely warned. Had Comrade Nimbkar had an opportunity of cross-examining the said C. I. D. constable, I am sure it would have been possible to show that the constable had told lies in his affidavit although it was sworn.

Another instance of callousness in the matter of bail is the case of Comrade Muzaffar Ahmad. He applied for bail on medical grounds several times as he has been suffering very badly from tuberculosis. But even in this case the Prosecution was hard hearted and went to the length of opposing his bail application, the Magistrate, the Sessions Judge of Meerut and even the Allahabad High Court supported the opposition and rejected his applications on various occasions. It is only very recently the authorities were compelled to grant bail to Comrade Muzaffar because his disease has become more serious.

In law an accused person is presumed to be innocent till his guilt is definitely proved. And although according to this principle of bourgeois law we are innocent and our guilt is not definitely established our incarceration continues from day to day, month to month and year to year.

JURY.

The clearest test of the judicial attitude of those concerned with our trial is provided by the manner in which the question of Jury has been dealt with.

We have tried by all possible means to get the benefit of a Jury Trial, for two reasons, first because we consider that any jury would see the extraordinary length to which Imperialism has had to go in the formulation of its law, and in the conduct of the case in order to convict us, and this would be in our favour. I do not mean that the assessors will not see the same thing, but assessors have no power, either theoretically or practically, and the Cawnpore Case has completely shown it. It is worth quoting the concluding sentence of the judgment of the Sessions Judge in the Cawnpore Case.

"Agreeing with two assessors and differing with the third

as regards Usmani, agreeing with one assessor and differing from the other two as regards Muzaffar Ahmad, and differing from all the assessors as regards Nalini Gupta and Dange I convict all the accused and sentence each of the said accused to four years' rigorous imprisonment."

I may incidentally remark here that the above formula may be useful in this case also while writing the judgment. It is said that history repeats itself and the same thing might be found repeated as far as the Communist accused in this case are concerned.

The second reason is that trial by jury is one of the "treasured liberties" of the British subject, which has been maintained for many centuries, and the denial of which, after all possible means of obtaining it have been tried, is itself a very revealing fact.

We applied first to the Magistrate on 23-7-29. He rejected our application with the following remarks:

"There was a mass of documentary evidence in this case which it would be impossible to expect a jury to cope with..... In a case of this length there would certainly be minor casualties in the ranks of jury, and each one would necessitate an adjournment or retrial, and the case would never end.....justice would be hindered and not forwarded by giving a jury in this particular case."

His next argument was still more remarkable from one whose job it is to uphold the dignity and impartiality of the law:—

"Man was a political animal and there was a popular tendency to look upon this trial as a political one. It would be almost inevitable that the opinion of each jury man would be swayed by his political leanings, either for or against the accused, and the verdict, if at all conclusive, would quite possibly have little relation to the merits of the evidence.....justice was more likely to be done in a case like this by a trained judge than by a jury."

We shall wait and see what justice this Court is going to give to us.

We appealed to the Sessions Court against this decision on 20-11-29 with a negative result. But the judgment was even more remarkable. The Sessions Judge admitted that Chapter XXXIII of the Criminal Procedure Code applied to this case. And from this it follows that we are entitled for a trial by jury under the law. But, essentially for the same reasons given by the Magistrate, he too considered that the ends of justice in this particular case would be better served without a jury. After all, the Magistrates and

Sessions Judges all of them form part of the same Imperialist machine. How can they then differ from each other?

Our application on the same subject to the High Court had the same result. The Chief Justice in his judgment of 27-1-30 continued the extraordinary attitude of his subordinates. He begins with the strange statement. "For some reasons which I do not very clearly understand, the defence are set upon having a jury and they think they would derive some advantage from it."

But he continued: "If in a trial by jury the evidence were to go to the length that all or some of the 31 accused had adventured upon a conspiracy of which the ultimate object was the overthrow of the Government of His Majesty to the King Emperor by an armed revolution (which is alleged) that is a matter which might be regarded very gravely by a jury, and they might not take a clear and judicial view of the evidence.

(We are very thankful to His Lordship for his anxiety on our behalf).

He repeated the remarks of subordinates about the "superhuman" task for a jury represented by the case, and rejected the application.

In this application the point was stressed that those accused who were residents of Calcutta and Bombay and the majority of the accused came from these Presidency towns are being deprived, by being tried at Meerut, of the right to a trial by jury which they normally enjoy by reason of their place of residence. The Chief Justice had already replied to this point in 1909 July as follows:—

"This makes no impression on me. The alleged fact is that they conspired at Meerut, and if in truth they did so, they must, in the absence of very special circumstances be content to be tried by the procedure ordinarily applicable to the accused at Meerut."

On this occasion he simply repeated the above words. It is a very neat trick of his Lordship. But we would point out that out of the 23 accused from the cities of Calcutta and Bombay only two are alleged to have "conspired" at Meerut.

The claim was also made that the presence of three British subjects amongst the accused rendered Chapter XXXIII of the Criminal Procedure Code applicable to this case, and that therefore a jury must be given. This was rejected on the ground that it was not "expedient in the ends of justice" that this provision of Chapter XXXIII should be applied.

This last point has given rise to adverse inferences. It is supposed that the three European accused were raising some "invidious claim" for jury which would apply to them and not to other accused. I think that this is not the nature of the provision made under Chapter XXXIII. A jury given under this chapter would try all the accused.

When all these attempts failed, as a last resort, we appealed through the Court by a telegram to the Government of U. P. early in February 1930, to declare this district a jury district for the purpose of this case under S. 269 Cr. P. C. The result was negative.

In the House of Commons a request was made on 15-7-29 to the Labour State Secretary for India that he should see that jury was given in this case. He replied "The matter was now before the Court and he did not propose to interfere." (Pioneer 18-7-29).

The fact that the case was before the Court was irrelevant. He had constitutional power to "interfere" through the Government of U. P. but he did not care to do so.

I have stated that we started on this long course of applications and appeals in accordance with a definite policy. We were sceptical from the beginning of obtaining any advantage from them and our scepticism was completely justified from the long record I have given. But we wished to undertake it, if only for the purpose of exposing more completely the class character of the judicial machinery and the nature of the "liberty" enjoyed by the British subjects. I feel that we have achieved this object almost thoroughly.

Government's legal aid for defence.

Now I propose to deal with another important matter from our point of view. Its importance is particularly enhanced because the late State Secretary of India has from time to time tried to mislead the members of the House of Commons that legal aid is provided by the Government to the accused. Therefore this question of legal aid to the accused must be examined a bit thoroughly. On one occasion Mr. Wedgwood Benn, Exstate Secretary replied in the House of Commons as follows:

"As far as the defence was concerned, the Government had every desire that accused should have proper facility, and had taken steps to assist them financially in this connection." (Statesman 30-4-31.)

On another occasion when asked to state the exact sum

allotted for this purpose and how many of the accused have availed themselves of it, he preferred not to reply to this question, and to prove the usefulness of the wise maxim "silence is golden." If Mr. Benn were to give a straight reply to the interpollation, he knew that there was a risk of its being compared with the mint of money spent by the Government over the Prosecution; and the financial assistance given to only two of the accused was only a drop in the ocean. Let us therefore go into the history of the matter in brief. After the dissolution of the Central Defence Committee in the beginning of the Sessions Trial, the late Mr. Langford James, the then Senior Crown Counsel approached some of the accused and inquired if we required financial assistance from the Government. The conversation on the subject went on for some time and on the 7-2-30 your Honour spoke to us in the open Court, advising us that if we desired the assistance of the Government in regard to legal representation we should make a request in writing and state our proposals definitely. On the 8-2-30 a statement was made on behalf of most of us that we did not desire to make such a request in writing. We however had informed Mr. James that if the Government would engage certain counsels of our choice on our behalf a majority of us would be represented.

After this the matter was almost dropped only to be revived on 13-8-30 when Mr. Kemp read out a statement in the Court and offered us a princely financial assistance of Rs 1000/- a month on behalf of the Government, whom he had very kindly acquainted with the broken financial condition of the defence with the permission of Mr. Sinha.

On 27-8-30 fourteen of us filed a statement on this question in which we pointed out how the proposal was niggardly and under what circumstances both proposals were made to us, further indicating that even if the proposals were accepted by us, how it would not be an adequate defence because of the large number of accused, evidence against them is of widely varying nature, and among them there are individuals and groups who wished to take up a number of distinct lines of defence. Even during the Magisterial Inquiry, when the Defence Committee made what they regarded as inadequate arrangement, at least four counsels were maintained. We frankly confessed in this statement our suspicion about these two offers, about which Mr. Kemp had then felt a bit annoyance, but later even to—particularly the propaganda carried on in this respect by the Secretary of State—quite justified our suspicion. The Government wanted to hide the scandalous conduct of this case, namely choosing an out of the way place like Meerut as a place for trial, the refusal of jury trial etc, by giving this small

bribe, and declare to the world that not only all facilities were given to the defence but even money is provided for the defence lawyers of the accused. We clearly saw through the game and rejected the offer with contempt which it richly deserved. Later however two of the accused namely Messrs. Thengdi and Banerji, I understand put in an application to the Government in writing for financial aid for their legal representation; and it was granted. I want to declare that excepting these two accused none of the rest are availing themselves of this assistance, and if Mr. Bena, the ex-State-Secretary was giving that impression to the public and to the members of the House of Commons, I must say that he was telling a blatant lie.

As against this let us see how tons of money is spent by the Government for this Prosecution. Unfortunately the account books of Mr. Nabi are not available to us and therefore our estimate with regard to the expenditure may not be exact. We understand that the services of late Mr. Langford James and his Junior were engaged for this Prosecution even before the case began, and he was paid Rs 1020/- a day. After Mr. James came Mr. Kemp, our present Crown Counsel, who, as Mr. Brailsford has said in an article on the conduct of this trial, earns the same amount every day with silent dignity. In this connection I cannot resist the temptation of saying, which I have once said in this Court, that the Crown Counsel in this case earns more than the monthly earning of the Indian Viceroy although he has to shoulder heavy responsibilities in maintaining the control of the Sovereignty of His Majesty.

In the month of February last a question was asked in the Assembly by Mr. Hari Raj Sarup regarding the expenditure incurred for this case. Sir James Crerar stated that the approximate expenditure on the Meerut Conspiracy Case up to the end of 1930 amounted to Rs 7,32,000/-. This figure was characterised by one Mr. Salig Ram of the Meerut Defence Committee as an underestimate. He published a letter in the "Hindustan Times" of 6-2-31 and therein Mr. Salig Ram has very conclusively proved how the above figure was a deliberate underestimate. The whole letter is interesting and throws a flood of light on the fabulous amount of expenditure carried on by the Government on this case when at the same time they are talking of retrenchment and economy, and when committees after committees are appointed to suggest economy measures with the idea of balancing the budget. This letter being a thorough exposure of the Imperialist Government, I propose to quote it in full. Mr. Salig Ram writes:

"In view of the general sensation created by the announcement in the Legislative Assembly about the enormous sums of

money already spent by the Government on the Meerut Conspiracy Case, we wish to bring to the notice of the public that the figures given by Mr. Crerar are a gross underestimate of the total cost. The sum of Rs 7,32,000/- which the Government admits to have already spent on this case, goes merely to cover the fees of the two Crown Counsels for the last 21 months up to the end of December 1930. The fee of the Senior Crown Counsel has been Rs 34,000/- per month and that of the Junior Counsel Rs. 3000/-. Calculating on this basis and making the necessary deductions for the two months following the death of Mr. Langford James when the Junior Crown Counsel was acting in his place with enhanced fees, we arrive exactly at the figure given by the Government in the Assembly."

"One must however take into account the sum spent under the various heads of running expenses which are probably met from the secret funds of the Central Government, or the Provincial Budget of the U.P. Government. We may mention a few of the most important heads of expenditure, such as (1) The Prosecution Staff in the office expenses (Rs 4000/- per month), (2) The Judge and the Court staff (Rs 4000/- per month), (3) Special Guards and lorries (Rs 1500/- per month), (4) Assessors (Rs 1000/- per month) etc. Besides this the printing of the huge bulk of the prosecution exhibits, depositions, orders etc., covering thousands of foolscap pages has cost no less than Rs 8000/- roughly. The summoning of the ten officers of the Scotland Yard who came all the way from England to give evidence in this case must have cost at least Rs 20,000/-, the total number of Prosecution witnesses in this Court and the Lower Court comes to about 600/-, their travelling, board and lodging expenses would total up roughly Rs 6000/- up to date."

"If we add up the running expenses for 21 months and also take into account the other items of expenditure just mentioned we arrive at an additional round sum of Rs 4,00,000. Thus the total sum of the Meerut Case has already cost the Indian taxpayers well nigh on Rs 1150,000/-."

"This estimate covers 21 months closing with December 1930. We have not taken into account the fact that Prosecution Counsel was engaged three months before the arrest nor have we added the heavy fees which an eminent counsel as the late Mr. James must have charged for reading the brief. The expenses of such special witnesses as the Handwriting Expert involving a lot of technical photography are also left out of account."

"Apart from this, the case is by no means near conclusion. The recording of the evidence of the Prosecution witnesses is

still going on. If the case proceeds at the present rate it may take perhaps a year more to reach the final stage. The total monthly expenditure including the Counsels' fees are about Rs50,000/-. Thus every additional month adds half a lakh to the enormous sums cited above."

Recently there appeared another article by one Mr. G.K. Sharma on the same subject of cost of this prosecution. The writer estimates it at Rs. 25,00,000. This is retrenchment in action.

Can there be a worse indictment of the judicial administration than the above letter of Mr. Salig Ram? On the continent this case is already begun to be compared with the Dreyfus Case; this comparison may stand as far as the scandalous conduct of such cases is concerned, but I do not believe that there is any other instance of a criminal trial where in such a huge amount of money has been recklessly spent,

D/31. 10. 31.

As against this was not the Government offer of Rs.1,000 per month for the defence of the accused an act of deliberately causing a wound first and filling it with powdered salt thereafter? Nothing can be more cruel than this.

I may also say here before I proceed further that during all these 34 months the defence has not been able to spend more than Rs. 25,000. Can it be called an adequate opportunity for defence as against the fabulous fortunes of the Prosecution?

I may point out here that not only we have no equal opportunities for defence, but whatever the resources our friends abroad are able to collect for us, that too is not allowed by the Government to reach us. 180 marks were sent to Comrade Muzaffar Ahmad from Germany, but he never was able to get them. This money was returned to the sender. The latest instance about the sums of 500 dollars sent by the I. L. D. of America are that it was also withheld under some obscure section of the Post Office Act in spite of the proclamation of the Government of India that the money meant for our defence shall not be withheld. This amount was withheld and it was admitted by Mr. Benn in the House of Commons. We do not know if this money was returned to the American Bank through which it was sent. Even if this money was returned to the Bank we are the losers, because the news has arrived from our friends there that this Bank has recently closed its doors. If any body who is responsible for this loss it is the Government of India.

Before concluding this section I cannot help saying a few words about this Court's "judicial frame of mind". When your Honour began trying this case early 1930, it was impressed upon us every now and then that this Court possessed "the judicial frame of mind".

we have by now full experience of it. There are on record several orders, passed from time to time on legal points raised by our lawyers and ourselves, which clearly show how the scales of justice that this Court holds, always lean towards the side of the Prosecution. we also got several orders passed by your Honour on the bail applications of several of the accused of which the order on Comrade Hutchinson's bail application is an extraordinary one. In this order your Honour makes the following remark while refuting the argument of Comrade Hutchinson regarding the calling of defence witnesses:—

"Moreover applicant's own history suggests that as a prudent man he must necessarily have considered this question of witnesses long ago. His house was searched and property taken away in March 1929. He knew all about the arrest of his present co-accused. His activities after that date were of the same line as those before it. In my opinion he must have contemplated the possibility that he also would be arrested, and must, like the intelligent man he is, have considered whom he could call to give evidence as to his true character in case that should ever be necessary.

This is one of the illustrations. Another example can be found in the note your Honour especially appended to the evidence of Colonel Rahman, the improvised handwriting expert, when he was being cross-examined by Mr. Sinha on 10th September 1930. The note reads as follows:—

"Light very bad during today's examination of this witness."

This witness was making mistakes after mistakes in his cross-examination while identifying the documents and recognising the handwriting of the accused. The same witness had identified the handwriting very ably when the Prosecution examined him. On this particular day the witness made many mistakes and the Prosecution was feeling very nervous about it. In order to help the Prosecution the Court went out of its way to make the note. No note was taken of the fact that the witness had not made any complaint about the light. It was only when it was pointed out to the Court by the defence that the Court took another note to that effect on

16th September. Instances of this nature can be multiplied, but I think it is hardly necessary.

W. P. P. Documents.

Now I shall explain some of the documents put to me at the very outset. I take P. 1835.

P 1835:— I do not know anything about this letter. I never received it nor do I know V. S. Power to whose address this letter is supposed to have come. I was not at all connected with an organisation called the Bombay Labour League which is mentioned in the body of this letter.

P 1942:— This is a report made by the C. I. D. Inspector Mr. Desai of the Lenin Day meeting held on 22nd January 1927. It was organised under the auspices of the Congress Labour Party. I was present in this meeting as I was the principal organiser of this meeting. Mr. K. F. Nariman was to preside over the meeting, but he could not attend on account of sore throat. The Prosecution has made much of these meeting and demonstrations. I shall therefore briefly explain why Lenin Day is celebrated by the oppressed people throughout the world.

This day is celebrated to dedicate to the memory of Lenin, the creator of the Russian Communist Party, leader of the Russian Revolution and the founder of the Communist International. His memory inspires the toiling masses who are oppressed and exploited by the bourgeoisie throughout the world. His work has not only taken root in the masses of workers and peasants of Russia—he is the symbol of the World Revolution in every country. Lenin is dead, but he has left behind him a compact army, an army of steel, which under the banner of Leninism will triumph. It was Lenin who created a real International. It was Lenin who was able to rally round the banner of Communism not only the Proletariat of Europe and America but also the oppressed and exploited peoples of the colonies and semi-colonies.

The study of Leninism in all its phases is one of the most important tasks of the International Proletariat. His teaching have enriched not only the Russian Bolsheviks but also the Communist Parties of the whole world with the great experience, from which we shall be able to derive for many years to come, our replies to the most complicated questions that face us. The main ideas of Lenin are:—

- (1) The alliance of the workers with the peasants.
- (2) The national question.

(3) The Dictatorship of the Proletariat.

While applying these three ideas of Leninism, it must be always remembered that they are the weapons in our revolutionary struggle against the world bourgeoisie. It is the duty of the revolutionary Leninists to preserve these weapons, and sharpen them still more.

The awakened masses of the colonial countries naturally look to this great leader of the world Proletariat with comradely veneration and are showing signs of following upon the footsteps of the Russian Proletariat who, under the leadership of Lenin, brought about the Russian Revolution.

Lenin paid special attention to such countries as China, India, Persia, Turkey etc. He had an excellent knowledge of the oppressed peoples of the East, though he never came into close touch with them and did not know their language. He correctly guessed their feelings, lived for them and was their hope.

Although Lenin is dead, Leninism lives; it has created an army which is preparing for the final overthrow of the world bourgeoisie. It has kindled the torch of liberation among the colonial peoples. The less experienced colonial Proletariat is rapidly learning the lessons of Leninism which alone clearly show the path of emancipation.

The Congress Labour Party and the Workers' and Peasants' Party, which is the Party of complete Independence, should naturally celebrate Lenin Day and try to give practical lessons in the methods of complete liberation from the bondage and slavery of Imperialism.

P. 852:— This is a telegram sent by me as the Secretary of the W.P.P. to Mr. D.R. Thengdi, the President of the Party, asking for his permission for publishing the programme of the Party. Following upon the reply received from him expressing his consent I gave to the press the programme of the Party.

P. 851:— Which is a cutting from the Bombay Chronicle, is the part of the Programme of the Party which I had given to the Press for publication; it announces the formation of the Workers' and Peasants' Party in Bombay.

P. 1353:— I have already admitted that I was a member of the Bombay O.P.P. right from its inauguration and was its first General Secretary. I do not want to say anything more about this exhibit.

P. 1355 (4) :— This is a letter written by Mr. Thengdi to me. Mr. Thengdi's remarks about the Marwaris of Bombay and the capitalist class coming forward to help the W.P.P. is unnecessarily exaggerated. How Mr. Thengdi happened to write about it can be thus explained. The Marwaris' Youth League presented Comrade Saklatwala a purse of Rs 150/- which he handed over to the Party funds to me. This news was published in the papers next day. And Mr. Thengdi after reading it in the newspapers happened to refer to it probably in a jocular manner. Mr. Thengdi in his reply, while explaining the exhibits, has stated* he was making fun of the idea of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat and was taunting those who believed in it. Nobody would seriously take Mr. Thengdi's remark in this letter. I at any rate did not give a serious thought to it.

P 844: This is a telegram sent by me asking Mr. Thengdi to come down to Bombay to attend May Day celebrations in 1927. I shall explain the significance of the May Day celebrations later.

P 1940: This is a covering letter to the programme that was drawn up by the Party, and it was to be moved in the form of a resolution in the A. I. C. C. meeting in Bombay in 1927. Comrades Nimbkar and Joglekar both members of the A. I. C. C. were authorised to put this programme forward in the A. I. C. C. meeting. By this covering letter I had circularised the programme to all the members of the All India Congress Committee in advance in order to secure their support.

P. 1349 (2): I was printer, publisher and editor of the "Krantii" in 1927. In this Court P. W. 223 Mr. Xavier Desa, the Chief Clerk of the Office of the Chief Presidency Magistrate of Bombay proved certain declarations; but this document is not proved by him which he ought to have done. I am specially bringing this to the notice of the Court.

P. 2311: This is the report of the meeting to protest against electrocution of Sacco and Vanzetti. It was organised by the Workers' and Peasants' Party of Bombay. The report of the speeches delivered in this meeting is incorrect. The reporter Mr. A. K. Chaudhri Sub Inspector of Police of Bombay is not a shorthand reporter and this report is made from his memory. It cannot therefore be reliably correct.

* I also published a pamphlet for Sacco and Vanzetti which was sold in this meeting. The report mentions the sale of some other books outside the Hall. The organisers of the meeting had not put up these books for sale. I do not know who had done so.

I may briefly mention as to why this meeting was organised. The Prosecution calls it a Communist demonstration because to them everything appears Communist. In fact these two Italian working men who were the victims of American Capitalism were not Communists which will be quite clear from their last declarations. The whole point why this case received the world-wide publicity was due to the flagrant methods of the White Terror which American Capitalism used in dealing with these radical workers. The whole judicial machinery of blood-thirsty American Capitalism was set in motion in order to suppress these two Italian workers who were teaching their comrades, in America, to unite and fight against the onslaught of Capitalism.

During the seven years of the trial of these two martyrs the mask of the sham American democracy was torn to pieces and the hideous character was exposed in the most effective manner. Our Party wanted to demonstrate to the oppressed people of India how the White Terror inaugurated by the international Capitalism and Imperialism was essentially the same; because incidents like the electrocution of these poor Italian working men very graphically illustrate our point. I shall later have an occasion to refer to this exhibit when I shall explain it further.

Activities among the Bombay Dock-Workers.

P 548 (10): This is a handbill issued by me announcing the meeting of the dock workers of Bombay. In the month of January 1929 I was busy organising the Dock Workers' Union in Bombay. This handbill is one of the many handbills I issued in that connection. There are in Bombay in all five big docks namely (1) Mazagaon (2) Princes (3) Victoria (4) Alexander and (5) R. I. M. Docks. Out of these, Mazagaon Docks are owned and used by P. and O. Company where repairs of their steamers is carried on. There is a big workshop of the P. and O. Company which employs nearly four to five thousand workers. The R. I. M. or better known as the Government Docks belong to the Royal Indian Marine; and here also there is a big workshop employing about 2,000 workers a day. The building and repairs of the Royal Indian Marine vessels is done in this dock. The remaining three docks are under the control of the Bombay Port Trust and through them a huge amount of import and export of goods is conducted. In these docks also thousands of workers are employed every day, most of whom are daily wage earners. These poor workers working in these docks handle a great bulk of imported and exported goods and assist in commerce and industry of Bombay. However these workers who has the capitalists in

making huge profits by their labour are most uncared for, live in the most unsanitary places, have no stability of jobs and are miserably exploited on all sides. In some of these docks there is a contract system. A contractor who generally is a big burly Pathan who dictates his rates of wages early in the morning and engages men in hundreds; this contractor gives men to the dock authorities with whom he has rates and wages fixed up which of course are more than what he offers. And thus this middle man supplier of labour makes ample money to fatten his bank accounts. The rates of these contractors hardly go beyond six to ten annas a day. One finds quite early in the morning a huge concourse of these poorly clad humanity looking for getting a job, standing in long rows in these Bombay docks. I decided to organise these workers into a union with a view to improve their condition. I began to move about the dock side in the small hours of the morning in the early part of the year 1929. I used to talk to them and explain how they were deceived by the contractors, by the dock authorities and by the social system of Capitalism. I used to address them in small groups. Soon I gathered round a small group of these dock workers and on 12-2-29 the Dock Workers' Union was formally started with Mr. Jhabwala as the President and myself as the General Secretary. Prior to this, small separate unions of better paid workers and clerks in the Port Trust Dock had existed. My idea in starting this union was to unite all these separate unions into one big and powerful union of all the Bombay dock workers. I succeeded in getting the R. I. M. Dock workers and Mazagaon Dock workers who soon joined the union and the organisation began to grow by leaps and bounds.

In the R. I. M. Dock, which is the Government dock, also employs workers who are daily wage earners in the sense that they are not permanent men and the services are not pensionable. Any day a worker is refused ticket and is thrown out on the street. There are men in this dock who have worked for twenty to thirty years as carpenters; revetters, machine men, ship builders etc and in spite of such long and faithful services these men continued to be daily wage earners, they get no provident fund nor any holidays. On the other hand whenever there is the slack season these men are refused work and have to submit to the enforced unemployment.

Bribery and corruption is the every day affair which is mainly due to the contract system of supply of labour. Every worker trying to secure the continuity of his job is forced to resort to these corrupt practices of giving bribes. When the Union came into existence, it began to investigate into these cases of bribery and corruption. The contractors, therefore naturally looked upon

the union as their enemy and started counter-propaganda amongst the men, asking them not to join the union.

Immediately after starting the Union we got it registered under the Trade Unions Act of 1926. But although the Union was thus registered still the Commander of the Royal Indian Marine Docks refused to recognise the Union. However, the mere existence of the Union had a check upon several malpractices prevalent in the docks such as (1) the acceptance of bribes to give precedence for better paid jobs etc., to a great extent. The Prosecution has taken exception to a passage from my article in the "Kranti" dated 30-6-28 (P930 T) entitled "The Dock workers and revolution." In this article I have suggested that the dock workers in all important parts in India be organised into Trade Unions. These Trade Unions in different places then be interconnected into a strong and powerful federation of dock workers. If such an organisation is brought into existence, the conclusion I draw in this article is that it will be able to control the trade and commerce of the country; and that such an effective control by the workers is a modern weapon to fight Capitalism. This weapon can also be used by joining hand with other workers for bringing about the successful revolution against Imperialist rule and establishing instead the rule of the workers and the peasants. I do maintain that whatever I wrote was correct and I stick to it.

P 818: is a letter from Mr. Thengdi to me dated 8-2-28 and mentions his "views re our cooperating with the All Parties Conference at Delhi." I do not now remember what these views were. He had also given me, as the Secretary of the Party certain instructions about the forthcoming annual general meeting of the Party. I do not remember what the new scheme of Mr. Thengdi was, as it was not discussed at the meeting, but Mr. Thengdi had some ideas about carrying on propaganda among the peasants and he was probably referring to it in this letter. P1354 (6) is the same as this letter printed once again.

D/- 2. 11. 31.

P 1408 and 1409 are the entries of my address in the register of the "Kirti". I used to get a copy of the magazine occasionally in Bombay whenever Police censorship was a bit slack. It was in Urdu and I could not read it. Once or twice I was requested to write articles in English for this magazine which I did. They were probably translated into either Gurmukhi or Urdu; and I am told that they were published in this magazine.

P 1626:— I do not know anything about this letter. I know that a Conference of the workers and peasants was to be held

in Lyallpur 1928. I was invited to attend this Conference; but I could not do so on account of work in Bombay in connection with these General Strike of the Textile workers; but for this heavy work I would have attended the Conference.

P1234 seems to be an invitation for attending this Conference.

P 1110— This seems to be a letter from Mr. Kadam to Comrade Joglekar and makes reference to me. Mr. Kadam had asked for a catalogue of books on Communism and other Labour literature and I remember to have given him one or two addresses of book firms in England. He also wanted some information about Trade Unions in Russia and some other Labour information. And I suggested to him to refer to the Soviet Year Book; that is how the reference to it has come in this letter.

P 1631 is an invitation sent to me by Mr. Kadam to attend the Bundelkhand Peasants and Workers' Party's Conference held under the Presidentship of Mr. Jhabwala. In the ordinary course I would have attended this Conference also, but the circumstances in Bombay did not enable me to do so. The Bombay strike was then just over, and the terms of settlement arrived at between the mill-owners and the Strike Committee were not being kept by the former. As a result there were occurring a number of partial strikes of the Textile workers. And the only active Union, namely the Girni Kamgar Union was required to shoulder the responsibility for the settlement of these lightning strikes. We, the officials of the Girni Kamgar Union, were extremely busy with this work and in consequence I was unable to attend this Conference.

Mr. Kadam in his reply while explaining this exhibit has stated that he invited me to attend this Conference with a view to show that we at Jhansi were quite capable to build up an organisation on our own independent lines and according to our local needs". I do not understand the reason why Mr. Kadam wanted to give me of all persons this demonstration. I had never challenged Mr. Kadam's ability nor did I know Mr. Kadam until he himself wrote to me. As a matter of fact I should have been glad to know of such independent efforts based on local needs. We do not consider it our monopoly in starting these organisations. But whenever such organisations are started we think it necessary to enter them with a view to ensure that they function on the proper class lines instead of becoming hotch-potch organisations conducted by the Reformists. The significance of the fraction work which we conduct in various organisations, can be understood from our above attitude. We consider it the best way of penetrating an organisation where there is a genuine revolutionary element, of winning it over for the Communist policy and work.

A. I. W. P. P.

I was present in the Calcutta Conference of the All-India Workers' and Peasants' Party as a delegate representing the Bombay Workers' and Peasants' Party. I was elected on the Draft Committee of the A. I. W. P. P. which was responsible for drafting the various resolutions that were passed by the Conference. I also moved the resolution on the Trades Disputes Bill in this Conference.

The principal idea behind holding this Conference was to centralise the activities of the various provincial Workers' and Peasants' Parties and organise the movement of complete Independence throughout the country through this organisation.

It has been already pointed out to the Court that the Workers' and Peasants' Party was the Party inaugurated with a view to establish complete national Independence through revolution (P 1017). Several documents and these adopted by the W. P. P. and in particular P 1013 and P 309 make this object unambiguously clear. A number of comrades who preceded me in this Court have explained the stand of the Workers' and Peasants' Party in detail. Comrade R. R. Mitra conclusively showed in his statement how the W. P. P. was not a veiled Communist Party, as the Communist Party of India did exist quite independent of the Workers' and Peasants' Parties with entirely different programme. Also Comrade Spratt has thoroughly refuted the Magistrate's theory that the policy of the W. P. P. was decided abroad; I therefore do not propose to go into details and waste time in repeating it. In conclusion, I want to say that I entirely agree with what they have said in this connection, and wish to associate myself with it.

Q. The following exhibits relate to your connection with Trade Unions and Strikes:—

P548 (2) and (10), 129, 2080, 1375 and 989 Kranti of various dates, 544 (1), 548 (1), 662, 776, 932, 964, 815, 950, 963, 1247, 1248 954:

Speeches: P 1696 M2, 1697, 1700, 1701M2, 1702, 1703M2, 1704, 1708, 1709, 1711, 1714, 1716, 1717, 1718, 1719, 1720, 1721, 1722 1724, 1726 M1, 1729, 1729M1 (a), 1732 and 1736, 2238, and 2246.

The following exhibits relate to your activities in the A. I. T. U. C: P1494, 1383, 848, 849, 1878C, 827 and 526 (30). Have you anything to say about the above evidence. In case I have omitted to refer to any document which you anticipate will be relied upon against you you may deal with it in answering this question.

A. *The Girni Kamgar Union (Red Flag)*

At the time of my arrest I was the Secretary of the Girni Kamgar Union. I shall therefore deal with that part of the evidence now.

The history of the Girni Kamgar Union is the history of the historic struggles which the class-conscious Textile workers of Bombay raised against their class enemy. This organisation huge in dimensions and powerful in strength was probably the biggest Trade Union in the whole of the Asiatic countries. How therefore it came to be organised and what part it played in the leadership of the Proletarian Movement and how workers throughout India looked to it for inspiration, is an interesting account, and I shall therefore, while explaining some of the exhibits relating the Girni Kamgar Union attempt to trace briefly its short history for this Court to understand the possibilities of the workers' movement.

In the year 1927, the W. P. P. of Bombay first built up its contact with the Textile workers, and the Party representatives participated in the Manchester and Apollo Mill strikes wherein the Sassoons were attempting to introduce the new rationalisation scheme which the workers were opposing. This strike was conducted under the auspices of the Girni Kamgar Mahamandal of which Messrs. Alve and Mayekar were the leaders. Comrade Joglekar our Party representative—was on the Advisory Committee of this organisation and he as a member of the Party had a prominent share in the conduct of the strike which will be quite apparent from the reports appearing in the issue of the 'Kranti' (P 1375) dated 14th May 1927.

The millowners' offensive was secretly prepared and they were going on very cautiously in order to attack the workers and thrust upon them their rationalisation scheme with a view to reduce the cost of production and thereby make more profit.

As a reply to all these activities of the millowners to attack the worker's wages, the W.P.P. of Bombay distributed a hand-bill in the month of January 1928 pointing out that General Strike is the only weapon with which this offensive could be stopped. This suggestion did not then find favour and the reactionary Labour leaders such as Joshi, Ginwala and Co. vigorously opposed it. All the same in the month of April 1928, the situation became so bad that the workers had no other alternative left but to declare a General Strike which was an accomplished fact on the 16th of April 1928, after comrade Parashram Jadheo a mill worker had given his life as a sacrifice to the White Terror practised by the

Bombay police with the idea of terrorising them and frightening them to prevent them from going on strike. The intervening developments are fully dealt with by comrade Bradley and I do not think that it is necessary for me to refer to them again.

The records of this case and the oral evidence given by some of the witnesses show that the General strike was called in the first place by the Girni Kamgar Mahamandal with the assistance and guidance of the Bombay Workers' and Peasants' Party. It was also pointed out to your Honour by comrade Bradley in his statement how difficulties arose over the registration of that Union, because of Mr. D.R. Mayekar, who had been expelled from the Union, and was openly attacked by Mr. Alwe as having misappropriated the Union funds, and was keeping the records and papers of the Union. And when during the strike the mill owners put forth a condition that only registered unions shall participate in the negotiations, Mayekar was the first to go in for the registration of the Girni Kamgar Mahamandal—a paper union in his pocket—and was immediately granted registration by the Registrar of Trade Unions. Comrade Bradley has clearly exposed the doings of this strike breaker Mayekar who naturally got the fullest assistance from the owners and their allies, the Government officials.

Any way the fact remains that the Girni Kamgar Mahamandal, with which we were connected, when it approached the Registrar for registration, was informed that the Union was already registered by Mayekar.

Mr. Alwe in his statement has said that he had met Nimbkar and Joglekar in the Bombay Provincial Congress Committee and myself as working in the Dock Workers' Union, that he brought us to the workers' movement and that but for him the strike would not have been a success. I want to say that these are not the facts. The facts are quite the other way. From August, 1927 the Workers' and Peasants' Party and its influence had begun to penetrate among the workers' though of course it was not very great. From that time to April 1928 there had been nearly fifteen partial strikes (Fawcett Committee Report). And some of these strikes were negotiated by the representatives of the Girni Kamgar Mahamandal with the assistance of our Party members. I have already told you that our Party had issued a handbill advocating a General strike whereas the owners wanted partial individual mill strikes to kill the workers' power of resistance and impose upon them their scheme of wage cuts. The Girni Kamgar Mahamandal conducted these individual mill strikes, but always expressed itself against the General Strike move. When the W.P.P. issued the handbill, the Girni Kamgar

Mahamandal issued another handbill disapproving of the slogan of the General strike and this handbill is one of the defence exhibits.

While these developments were going on, the mill owners' attack was steadily growing and the rank-and-file workers saw the futility of meeting this attack by individual mills. The owner's attack was an organised and planned attack, and equally planned defence alone would save the workers from these disastrous consequences. They therefore began to see the truth of the General Strike slogan given by the W.P.P. and began to come to the Party for advice in spite of the opposition to that slogan of men like Mayekar and Alwe. When actually the rank-and-file workers began to approach the W.P.P. Mr. Alwe thinking that discretion was the better part of valour himself sought advice, and cooperation from the Party and thus at the invitation of the workers, the Party members began to participate in the conduct of the strikes from the month of February, 1928. And having further become convinced that the General Strike was the only weapon to fight with, they began a campaign to organise it. Messrs. Alwe and Kasse have now prepared their own cock-and-bull stories, because it no longer means applause but jail for several years to come. It is therefore quite natural that they should now call us outsiders and should try to show that there were differences between them and ourselves.

Under what circumstances the G.K.U. came to be formed on 22nd May, 1928, at a general meeting held at the Nagu Sayaji's Wadi has been pointed out by comrade Bradley, and almost all the leading members of the W.P.P. were unanimously elected as office bearers (P. 958 T). Mr. Alwe has attempted to show that we were elected because he did not oppose our election. I may point out that it was not a fact. The ideology of the W.P.P. and the work put in day and night by the W.P.P. members had created so much influence for the W.P.P. and it would not have been possible then for Mr. Alwe to drive us out of the movement even if he had willed. It is the rank-and-file workers who chose us in that meeting as the office bearers of the Union and not Mr. Alwe who almost claims the Union as his personal property.

The Union since its birth in May became the actual leader of the strike, in spite of the Joint Strike Committee which merely remained a deliberative body. The day-to-day propaganda and conduct of the strikes remained in the hands of the G. K. U. and this policy was influenced by the W. P. P. of Bombay. I may here point out the work put in by the W. P. P. members after the formation of the G. K. U. and up to the end of the strike. Immediately after the formation of the Joint Strike Committee the first

problem that faced us was to collect information and prepare the workers' case. Dange was entrusted with this job.

The second problem that confronted us was the organisation of the Volunteer Corps in order to start picketing of the mills. The work was entrusted to me. In the beginning the Police Commissioner had threatened to prohibit us from undertaking this work. Now in a strike struggle to picket the factories peacefully is a legitimate right of the workers; and this right had to be asserted by defying this tyrannical order of the Police Commissioner. It was therefore decided that I should lead a leading party of pickets and offer myself for arrest if necessary, to assert this right of picketing for the workers.

This work of organisation of Volunteer Corps and picketing remained in my charge up to the end of the strike. I shall deal with the organisation of Volunteer Corps which the Prosecution describe as Red Army a little later. In addition to this, general propaganda and organising meetings etc. also was in my charge.

Comrade Nimbkar, the Joint Strike Committee's Secretary was in charge particularly of the relief of the strikers, and the general work of the strike was his responsibility; whereas comrade Ghate was in charge of the press propaganda such as issuing bulletins and statements from time to time.

All this work which went to consolidate the Strike Movement naturally went for the W. P. P. and following which nobody could take from them although several attempts were actually made to oust us out of the G. K. U. later. There is no further proof necessary therefore to show that the G. K. U. was the mainstay and the leader of the strike, and its policy was moulded and put into practice by the W. P. P. of Bombay. What part the G. K. U. played during the strike has been detailed, and without referring to it in more details I shall at once proceed to describe the phase the G. K. U. went through after the strike was over.

In the month of October 1928 the General Strike was over after the appointment of the Fawcett Committee. Mills began to work from 6-10-28: it was agreed between the Millowners' Association and Joint Strike Committee that the strikers returning within a month would be taken up on their jobs.

The G. K. U. had decided to organise the workers, who by the prolonged experience of the strike had become very conscious and had realised their strength and power. We therefore set about the job with a determination and cautiousness. Five centres or branch offices of the G. K. U. were opened at important localities

in the mill area namely Lal Baug, Delisle Road, Naygaon, N. S. Wadi and Siwri (P 958). A hurricane campaign of meetings was opened at each centre in order to explain to the workers the urgent necessity of strengthening the organisation, because the leaders of the G.K.U. were almost sure that the Government Inquiry Committee would grant the award against the workers; and in that eventuality they must be ready to defend themselves against the coming attack. The Sassoon Mills had continued the "two frames and three looms" system to which the workers were opposed. Other millowners began to adopt methods of harassing the workers in all possible ways. It was therefore found necessary for the Managing Committee of the G. K. U. to consider the whole position and adopt ways and means to counteract the secretly prepared attack upon the mill workers with a view to kill the spirit of the workers and their rising organisation, namely the G. K. U. The Managing Committee therefore decided in its meeting held on the 25-10-1928 to collect special fund of Rs. 1,00,000/- for fighting the Sassoons' attack of "two frames and three looms" system; a General Strike Fund of Rs 2,00,000/- was to be raised in case the workers were forced to go on strike by the mill bosses, and to raise a Volunteer Corps of one thousand trained workers and to train one hundred speakers from among the workers in order to be able to conduct workers' meetings (P 958). I shall deal later as to how the G. K. U. succeeded in its object, and how the planned defensive of the workers helped them from the capitalist immediate offensive. With this programme the G. K. U. centres began to buzz with activity and life. The various centres immediately began organisation of the Mill Committees in each individual mill. These Mill Committees comprising of the departmental representatives were formed of the most conscious and active workers who were elected in the open meetings of that particular mill. These Mill Committees used to meet regularly to consider the departmental grievances of the mill, their grievances were properly represented to the mill management by the members of these committees. Each Mill Committee also elected their representative to work on the Managing Committee of the Union. Thus the Mill Committee was organisationally connected with the the centre, the Central Managing Committee of the Union and through this machinery all mill workers were interlocked in an organisation namely the G. K. U., which ultimately became a terror to the capitalist class and the defender and protector of the workers employed in the premier industry of Bombay.

The G. K. U. was otherwise known as the Red Flag Union, In the Managing Committee of 25-10-28 it was decided to get the Red Flag symbol registered (P 958). While explaining this, it has been suggested that "it was adopted because its colour does not fade

as a result of sun's heat or of any other cause. It always remains uniformly bright. It was selected only on account of this and the mark of the Red Flag was made. The Red Flag was neither hoisted as the sign of Moscow nor the mark of the Third International."

I want to say that this is an attempt to sidetrack the revolutionary policy and principles by which the G. K. U. and the rank and file textile workers of Bombay stood, and its purpose is quite obvious. During six months of the General Strike our ideology was so much instilled into the workers that when the Union began to function actively, after the strike was over, they proposed to hoist the Red Flag on the Union Offices and make it a symbol of working class unity, solidarity and class consciousness. They had known during the strike how the Red Flag was the flag of the Workers' Raj in Russia, and how the workers throughout the world cherished the ideal with revolutionary determination to establish their Raj by destroying the capitalist rule. The Red Flag symbolises the ideal concretely; and the class conscious textile workers chose to have it of their free will, as a symbol, declaring to the world that they were out to achieve their ideal namely the destruction of Capitalism and Imperialism and establishment of the rule of the workers. It is mere cowardice to describe it as a piece of cloth the colour of which does not fade. The Red Flag is hoisted not because its colour does not fade by sun's heat, it is there to signify the revolutionary unity of the workers, their determination to end exploitation from Capitalism and Imperialism. The Government and Indian capitalists naturally got scared away with the mere name of the Red Flag G. K. U. because they clearly saw in it their complete destruction.

D/- 3.11.31

The Girni Kamgar Union, as is well-known, was founded on the basis of class-struggle as every Trade Union is an organ of class-struggle. It clearly recognised that until capitalism was completely destroyed the fate of the workers would not be rendered satisfactory. It therefore recognised that its struggle must be strictly carried on, on the principles of class-struggle as against the principle of class collaboration, which the Reformist Trade Union leaders advocate. This is the principal reason why the Girni Kamgar Union incessantly carried on a campaign of exposing this treacherous leadership and its still more treacherous principles.

The Girni Kamgar Union, of course, at the same time considered that, in the initial stages of the struggle, the workers must be assisted in winning their day-to-day grievances. The

Union therefore fought inch by inch with the mill bosses and tried its level best to win the partial demands of the mill workers, always remembering the main principles and keeping it clear from the infectious disease of class collaboration.

The Girmi Kamgar Union was the first Trade Union which pointed out to the workers from time to time the dangers and pitfalls of introduction of communalism in the working-class movement. During the Bombay Hindu-Moslem Riots our Union took a definite attitude of neutrality and did not fall a prey to the official dodge. It firmly advised the workers to attend to their work and strenuously tried to maintain peace in the workers' area. The various handbills and appeals issued by the Girmi Kamgar Union during the February Riots will clearly prove what I say.

The Hindu-Moslem Riots of February, 1929, were intentionally engineered by the Moslem "goonda" and hireling Shaukat Ali who is to-day playing the same game on a larger scale as a delegate to the Round Table Conference. The principal idea behind this was to involve the workers of Bombay in it and kill their strong organisation, the Girmi Kamgar Union. It is also very significant that the riots took place at a time when the Indian Legislative Assembly was discussing the Public Safety Bill in Delhi. And actually the riots in Bombay were used as an argument to secure votes for the measure by the Government representatives in the Assembly.

Shaukat Ali, the buffoon of British Imperialism, was an easy tool in the hands of the scheming and cunning Hotson who has just retired from the job of Acting Governor of Bombay. Advantage was taken of the skirmishes that had taken place between the Oil Company strikers and the Pathans as a result of the latter's blacklegging and strike-breaking activity. A rumour was caused to be spread in Bombay and particularly in the mill area that the Pathans are kidnapping the children and this was used to work up the antagonism which naturally exists in the minds of the workers against some of them being the unscrupulous and terrorising moneylenders. Some of them had also been used as a catspaw by the Government of Bombay in the Bardoli agitation in order to terrorise the peasant population to make their payments of land revenue; horrible tales of Pathans' misdeeds were quite fresh in the minds of the people. All these circumstances were cleverly manipulated by interested and reactionary Imperialist agents who set about the job of spreading the children's kidnapping scare with a view to stage the pogrom of the Hindu-Moslem Riots.

Imperialist 'agents provocateurs' were set up to play their part in spreading all sorts of lies among the Hindu-Moslem masses in order to rouse their religious fervour to cut each other's throats. Hotson, the cleverest I.C.S. in the Bombay Presidency, was pulling the wires from behind the scenes. These agents were successfully carrying on their campaign of rousing the communal feelings, and the hooligans such as Shaukat Ali and company, encouraged from behind the pardah by the high Government officials, both combined to enact the drama of fratricidal war to kill each other and to destroy the abiding unity brought about by the Girni Kamgar Union between the Hindu and the Moslem Mill workers which had become an eyesore to the Government and the propertied classes of Bombay.

The W.P.P. of Bombay and the G.K.U., it must be pointed out, did not encourage the kidnapping scare, on the other hand they flooded the mill area with appeals through handbills and through public meetings, calling upon the workers not to believe the kidnapping scare, and to leave their work. But the plain clothed C.I.D. provocateurs used to go on spreading false rumours such as temples attacked, mosques burnt, women and children killed and so on so forth. On these rumours mill workers who mainly were Hindus used to stop work and come out to protect their homes. The idea in spreading these rumours was to involve the mass of Hindu male workers into active rioting and kill their organisation, the Girni Kamgar Union, by these means.

The Union, however, refused to be led into the snare and remained steadfast to its principle of "no communal bias" in the workers' movement at whatever cost.

During the riots I have seen the C.I.D.'s going about the mill area and manufacturing lies like several Hindu workers butchered, children buried and temples desecrated in such and such area. All these, however, turned out to be lies when properly investigated. They were meant to get the peaceful workers working in their mills on the street, so that the Imperialist machine-guns kept in readiness in the street corners could be set in motion to kill them like flies. The G.K.U. would not give the blood-thirsty Imperialists the chance to do so. Herein was the strength of G.K.U. and it continued to consolidate even more, when this organisation successfully emerged through the subtle attack planned by the Government and its agents.

It was openly admitted by Dr. Deshmukh, President of the Citizen's Peace Committee, and the Mayor of Bombay, that the G.K.U. had substantially assisted in quelling the riots, and keeping

the workers aloof from the cankers of communalism. Many persons have criticised us from various points of view as far as the Bombay Riots are concerned. The Government agencies have tried to put all the blame upon the G.K.U. for the riots, and have indirectly insinuated that the rumour of kidnapping children by the pathans was started by the Communist Labour leaders. They have, however, utterly failed in proving this unfounded allegation and the Police Commissioner has admitted in his "Report on the Course of the Riots" that the Police were unable to trace the source of the rumour of the kidnapping scare; that the Police agency which unearths and fabricates so many conspiracies should be unable in this case to find out as to who had spread the rumour is really very surprising. And still, the first recommendation which the Government Inquiry Committee on the February Riots made was "Government should take drastic action against the activities of the Communists in Bombay." This recommendation of the Committee clearly exposes the Government's underlying motives in staging the Bombay Riots at the cost of so many lives of the poor population.

Having pointed out the underlying motives behind the Bombay Riots, it will be now easy to take into account the criticism of some of the sympathisers of our Party and principles. One such critic in England writing about the Bombay Riots remarked:—

"Now it is very difficult to tell what is the position exactly. On the facts given one is bound to think that it was provocation aimed at stirring up a pogrom, i.e. to enable matters to reach a stage where the Military could intervene and shoot down the workers. Practically every fact that we have, gives the indication that it was provocation, the same as used to be in the Czarist Russia.

"The second point is that our comrades of the Workers' and Peasants' Party instead of saying to the workers who were chasing the strike-breakers "Continue to attack the Pathans as strike-breakers, go on to attack the employers of the Pathans and the Police supporting them and the British Government as well"... instead of doing this they joined with the bourgeoisie in saying "go back !", they issued leaflets telling the workers to go back. The whole thing seems like opportunism."

I want to maintain that the policy then adopted by the W. P. P. was correct, and the only saying policy from the workers' point of view; it was pointed out by our critic that "it was provocation aimed at stirring up a pogrom, i. e. to enable matters to reach a stage where the Military could intervene and shoot down the workers". Thus far our critic is quite correct, but the remedy

suggested in his criticism was that we ought not to have stopped there but that we ought to have called upon the workers to "go on to attack the employers of the Pathans and the Police supporting them and the British Government as well", only shows his lack of knowledge of the objective situation as it was then in Bombay.

Such mistaken criticism can be excused, it being based on the lack of facts and information, which is admitted. Our particular task at that moment, a task in which we succeeded, was to maintain the solidarity of the Bombay workers and to frustrate the attempt on the part of the British Government to put into operation the old Roman Law of "Divide and conquer". To have used the slogan as suggested at that juncture, would have led to much useless sacrifices on the side of the workers to be followed by demoralisation. This is just what the Government desired and we knew it, as we also understood that the time was not ripe for the workers to make such a move.

It is a fact that we held the confidence of the workers—Textile, Railway and other workers. It is also a fact that there was no bad blood between the Moslem and the Hindu workers as such. We called upon the workers to remain at work because we desired to prevent the pogrom which was what those who had instigated the riots desired to see. Our slogan to the workers to remain at work was neither opportunism or cowardice, we did not want to have a useless waste of workers' lives, we were certainly the best judges of situation.

The strike of the past 12 months, the continuous small strikes that were taking place almost every day and the riots had showed the workers, more than anything else could, the need for developing a permanent volunteer organisation. Our call for the enrolling of 5,000 drilled volunteers (P. 967) was followed up and regular organised groups of volunteers were formed and drilled, to discipline and prepare the workers, and to protect the workers' meetings, their offices etc.

From the bosses' side we had sufficient experience that apart from the use of regular Police and Military to suppress and intimidate the workers the employers had formed a corps of goondas and hooligans under the leadership of a bruiser who goes by the name of Milton Kubes. This bruiser hired by the millowners and with the connivance of the Police—sometimes with open support—would attend the meetings of the mill workers with his gang of "Goondas" and "Dadas" with the set purpose of breaking up the meetings. Under such circumstances it was little use for the workers to complain against such a formidable conspiracy arranged

between the Bombay mill-owners, the Police and the goondas. If there was any disturbance of the peace, the workers had to be blamed, if there was any riot, again the workers had to be blamed. And yet we have ample proof that the individuals wholly to blame for any such disturbance of the peace or riot were the very individuals who hypocritically claim to be the preservers of "law and order" and the keepers of the "peace".

The formation by the bosses of these gangs of hired hooligans to smash the workers' movement is not a new thing and certainly not confined to India. In other countries, more highly industrialised than India, these gangs are more highly developed into anti-working class and strike breaking organisations. In America we have the K. K. K. (Klu-Klux-Klan); in Germany the war brought into being an organisation known as the Technical Emergency Help, supported mostly by students to do the work of strike breaking. In Great Britain following the war we saw the introduction of several interesting organisations, some with the support and connivance of the Government and local authorities and some without.

The first was the "Citizens' Guard" formed to break the Railway Strike of 1919. Then "Jix (Lord Brentford)" brought into being the "organisation for the Maintenance of supplies" (O. M. S.) Generous support was given by the Federation of British Industries and the bosses generally to support this organisation. The President of this imposing body was none other than Lord Hardinge of Penshurst, formerly Viceroy of India, and the councils which ran the show were " a few patriotic citizens," among whom were three lords, two admirals, three generals and several captains of industry. This organisation was set up with the express purpose of strike-breaking during the period of the attack by the employers upon the workers' condition following the war.

The next organisation was the National Citizens Union (N. C. U.); this organisation was able to boast of providing five hundred volunteers (strike-breaking hooligans) " to maintain essential services " during the strike at Southampton in May, 1920, and offered its support to the Government during the 1921 Coal Strike.

The British Empire Union set up a so-called " Industrial Peace Department " which was supposed to carry on a campaign against " the dangers of revolution and Communism ". The British Fascists and the National Guard were other organisations brought into being with the active support of the Government and

the bosses organisations. These organisations have actively cooperated in all industrial disputes since the war, in cooperation with the police and the other Government machineries, acting as blacklegs protecting the blacklegs, breaking up workers' meetings etc.

I have put forward these instances to show that the goonda organisation under the leadership of the bruiser Milton Kubes of Bombay is only similar to these organisations in other countries, organised by private associations, with the connivance of the Government, to carry on strike-breaking activities, to break up the workers' meetings, to be labour pickets, to intimidate the workers and to assist the bosses in their attacks upon the workers' conditions.

It was because of this that the organisation of the workers into a Volunteer Corps became an immediate necessity, it was against this goonda organisation of the bosses that we called for 5000 drilled volunteers of workers. The proposition of the Prosecution that the call for a "Red Army" of 5000 volunteers was the prelude to the development of an armed force to overthrow the Government is as ridiculous as it is fantastic. The idea of the development of a volunteer corps of 5000 workers was specific, that it was to combat the strike-breaking organisation of the employers, to protect the workers meetings, pickets and union offices, and to generally assist the workers to success in their struggle. We do not say that they will not form the basis of the future workers' army and we do not say that we would not lead them when the time comes, but to say that these workers were organised at that time to overthrow the Government is too far-fetched.

In conclusion I should like to state that we were organising the G. K. U. on Communist lines. We opened centres throughout the whole of the mill area of Bombay, close to the mill gates at Lal Bagh, Delisle Road, Naygaon, N. S. Wadi, Siwri, Parel and so on; our object was to organise the whole of the mill workers. Further, our object was to break with the traditions which had stultified the development of Trade Unions in India in the past, that was the permanent outsider officials. With this object in view, we began to develop in each mill a Mill Committee to ensure that the future leadership of the G. K. U. would be with the rank-and-file workers. There was little need for us to propagate against the reformists Joshi, Bakhale and Co.; the workers had become thoroughly disillusioned from reformism. The policy of the G.K.U. was the militant policy of the workers based upon the class struggle, on this policy a programme was put forward and the workers were

being prepared for the further coming attack of the employers. (P 967 T and P 929 T). Not only were the workers to be prepared to resist the attacks of the employers but they were being organised to fight their class enemy and to obtain better conditions.

It was because the workers realised that the policy of the G.K.U. was correct and because the leaders of the G.K.U. had the confidence of the workers that we saw the beginning of the largest militant Trade Union that had ever existed in India, the G. K. U. (Red Flag) with its 70,000 membership.

It was our hope that the G.K.U. would give the lead to the workers throughout India to organise their industrial unions on similar lines; if this has not been done up to date, we are confident that the lessons of the G. K. U. have not been lost and that the workers on the railway, in all industries such as iron, steel, jute, cotton etc, must immediately set about the task of building such an organisation. Capitalism is to-day in the grip of an unprecedented and terrific world crisis; to attempt to extract itself from this crisis the workers' conditions in all countries are being attacked. If the workers have no desire to submit to these attacks and worsened conditions, then the G. K. U. must be rebuilt and the workers in all industries must follow the Bombay textile workers in building their own militant "Red Flag" unions.

P 544 (1): Simon Demonstrations.

I did participate and actively organised the Simon Hartal Day on the 3rd February 1928. I was also a member of the Workers Committee formed to organise this Hartal. The W. P. P. of Bombay was to a large extent responsible for the successful demonstrations and meetings that took place in Bombay on that day. But for the Party, the Hartal would not have been stiffened and so actively organised as we did.

The Indian bourgeois politicians were, no doubt, at that time very much displeased with British Imperialists because they expected to get a few seats on this Royal Commission; and had that happened the Indian bourgeoisie would surely have cooperated with the said Commission. In that case the boycott and counter movement of that character would have been confined only to the petty bourgeoisie and the working classes. But because of the mistake of the British Imperialists in excluding the members of the Indian bourgeoisie on it, the temporary oppositional bloc was created; all political parties such as Moderates, Congresswalas, Communalists joined in the boycott movement of this Commission.

The W. P. P. also was invited to join a Boycott Committee formed in Bombay of the representatives of all political parties; our Party nominated comrade Nimbkar and myself upon this Committee. Mr. Chimanlal Setalvad was the President of this Committee and Mrs. Sarojini Naidu was its Secretary.

It must be made quite clear that although the W. P. P. of Bombay cooperated with the other political parties, our differences were quite distinct. The extent of the "opposition" of these political parties to British Imperialism was very limited, and they were quite willing to submit to the Parliamentary Commissions and Committees which the British Imperialists might appoint from time to time. It is because this Commission was an "All-White Commission," as they termed it, they opposed and boycotted it. Whereas the W.P.P., the Party of the Complete Independence of India, vigorously contested the claim of British Imperialism and having pointed out that the British Parliament has no right whatever to appoint such commissions any longer and that Indian masses must rise in revolt and be completely independent. This difference in the political outlook was very distinctly maintained in whole Simon boycott agitation by the W. P. P. of Bombay. This political line of the W. P. P. was thoroughly appreciated by the petty bourgeois, and working class sections of Bombay who wholeheartedly and actively participated in the boycott demonstrations on the 3rd February 1928. In these demonstrations they carried banners such as "Down with Imperialism," "Nothing short of Independence," etc, and this is a clear proof of the appreciation of our political line. Witnessing these meetings and demonstration of the workers, students, clerks etc, the Indian bourgeoisie became tremendously frightened at the political influence gained by the revolutionary W. P. P., and when the Simon Commission returned again in the month of October 1928 they decided to drop the boycott. There were other political causes for this action on the part of the Indian bourgeoisie, as a section of them was won over by the British Imperialists with their usual policy of "divide and rule". But the main cause of dropping the boycott demonstrations against the Simon Commission on the second occasion was to be found in their fear of the Indian masses going out of their control.

The W. P. P. on 3rd February 1928 called upon the workers to go on one day's political strike to demonstrate their will to overthrow the rules of British Imperialism and to express their desire to be completely independent from the shackles of Imperialist chains. And I may point out here that we very largely succeeded in achieving this object. The B.B.C.I. workers in the Parel workshop, the G. I. P. Workers in the Matunga work shop,

the textile workers of Bombay, the municipal workers etc joined in their hundreds and thousands and responded to the call of the Workers' and Peasants' Party. These workers walked several miles and finally joined in the meeting at Foras Road arranged, and organised by the Hartal Committee, which worked directly under the influence and guidance of the Workers' and Peasants' Party. In this meeting speeches were made impressing upon the workers the urgent necessity of being politically independent. I also pointed out to the workers how this Commission composed of seven thieves was there to ensure the Imperialist loot by making the Indian masses poorer. In the end, several effigies of the members of the Commission were burnt, one of which was of Mr. MacDonald who today has become the toy of the Tory Party in England. (P. W. 244 Inspector Patwardhan):

In the petty bourgeois quarters like Gilgaon, the students' demonstrations and meetings were going on throughout the day and these too were organised by the members of the W. P. P. in collaboration with the Bombay Provincial Congress Committee, of which comrade Nimbkar was the Secretary, and the Youth League etc. In the evening there was a huge procession of students organised and led by the members of the W. P. P. and Youth League. Sir Chimanlal Setalvad— one of the Round Table knights—who was to preside over the public meeting at Chaupati, was frightened out of his wits at the tremendous mass demonstrations and other revolutionary activities throughout the day. He declined to preside over the public meeting at Chaupati and demanded the cancellation of the students' procession already arranged. Some of the weak-kneed Congress leaders, such as Mrs. Sarojini Naidu and Mr. Nariman, tried to persuade the students to disperse the procession near the University grounds; but the influence of our political line among the students was so great that they defied the Congress leaders and marched in procession to the great chagrin and displeasure of this Round Table knight. On the way the procession demonstrated in front of the offices of the "Times of India" and burnt the copies of the paper which had tried to ridicule the boycott movement that very morning. Ultimately, the procession did reach Chaupati where a separate meeting of the students was held and addressed by the members of the W. P. P.

The political influence of the W. P. P. among the working masses of Bombay was very much strengthened from this day, and it went on increasing by leaps and bounds.

In this connection, P. W. 215 Inspector Desai has produced the letter (P 1546 (1), alleged to have been written by me and

addressed to Sir John Simon when the Commission returned in the month of October 1928. I do not want to admit this exhibit; but I want to say that it is nothing but the expression of opinion from the point of view of the masses of this country. Sir John Simon has publicly invited such opinions; and huge amount of communications were addressed to him as the boycott of this Commission by the bourgeois political bodies was slackened down. This witness says that the Private Secretary of Sir John Simon handed over this letter to the C. I. D. Even supposing that this letter was genuine I do not understand why it should have been handed over to the Police.

D/- 4. 11. 31

P1267 and P1248:—From time to time I used to send news and reports of Trade Union activities to different papers. These two exhibits are probably the news articles I sent to the 'Spark'. I remember to have sent a copy of "Hell found" to the 'Spark' for review.

P 662 and P776, P932 and P964 are one and the same group photos of some of the members of the Managing Committee of the G. K. U.

P950 and 963 is a group photo of a section of the G. K. U. Volunteer Corps. Prosecution has described them as the "Red Army". I have already dealt with it elsewhere. I was invited to sit in the group photo by some of the volunteers. I fervently desire the allegation of the Prosecution about these men as "Red Army" will soon materialise; and the conditions for creating a fighting Red Army of the workers are brought about. Nothing will please me more than this.

P 815: This seems to be a statement issued by Mr. Thengdi as the President of the Kirkee Arsenal Workers' Union. I am referred to therein as having attended the strikers' meeting some time in the month of October, 1928. After the General Strike in Bombay was over, I paid a visit to Poona to see some of my friends and relatives. At this time the strike of the Kirkee Arsenal workers was going on and Mr. Thengdi asked me to attend and address the strikers' meeting which I agreed to do. After this meeting Mr. Thengdi, it appears, had issued a statement to the Press. The Prosecution connects the strike and the organisation of the Kirkee Arsenal Union with the alleged conspiracy and try to exaggerate the importance of the strike and the organisation of this Union which in reality was not a very big or important Union.

P 954:—This exhibit mentions that I took Mr. Ryan to the Murarji Gokaldas Mills. Mr. Ryan expressed a desire to see a Textile factory in Bombay. Accordingly I made arrangements with the Manager of the Morarji Gokaldas Mills who agreed to take us round his factory. While Mr. Ryan was having a round in this Mill, he made enquiries from the workers about their conditions, and found that the Indian workers were far more exploited than the workers in any other country.

P966 and 967 are two leaflets issued under the signatures of several of us and I have referred to them in the course of my statement on the G. K. U. Therefore, I do not want to say anything further about them in particular here. I have also explained *P 958*.

A. I. T. U. C.

The W. P. P. members first entered the Trade Union Congress in the year 1927, when its 8th Session was held in Delhi under the Presidentship of Rai Sahib Chandrika Prasad. Another notable thing was that this Session was attended by Comrade S. Saklatwala—then Communist member of the British Parliament. Several members of the W. P. P. attended this Session of the Trade Union Congress and moved several resolutions which clearly marked our Party entry into the organisation, firmly planting our influence in that body. It was in this Congress that Comrade Ghate was elected the Assistant Secretary of the T.U.C. Resolutions passed in this Congress, as for example the resolution on International unity, resolution against Imperialism, on China, greetings to Comrade S. Saklatwala M. P. distinctly marked the influence of the W. P. P. and its policy.

The following year also showed the progress of this influence as will be noticed from the resolutions passed in the Cawnpore Session of the Trade Union Congress. During the period between the Delhi and the Cawnpore Session of the Trade Union Congress the W.P.P. members very actively associated themselves with the Trade Union Movement though we had not succeeded very largely in securing official positions in the Trade Unions; yet at Cawnpore we were able to consolidate the Left Wing opposition to the Right Wing leadership and had reached a stage to challenge the Reformists on various questions relating to Trade Union policy. The Cawnpore Session of the T.U.C. was attended by Messrs. Purcell and Hallsworth as fraternal delegates of the British Trade Union Congress and Mr. Mardy Jones as fraternal delegate of the Workers' Welfare League of India in London.

In the Subjects' Committee of this Congress a resolution expressing sympathy with the aims and objects of the League against Imperialism was moved, but it was opposed by the official block composed of the Reformist Trade Union leaders and supported by Mr. Purcell who described the organisation as being under the influence of the Third International. This resolution was ultimately disallowed.

Our Party members had tabled resolutions, among others on the 10th Anniversary of the U.S.S.R, China, Imperialism, protest against refusal of passport to Comrade Saklatwala, and all were passed after heated discussions. This Congress recorded again the upward progress of our Party influence. We were able to capture more official positions and the old moderate leadership felt our rising influence; they clearly understood that the influence of their leadership was declining very rapidly.

In Cawnpore our Party made an effort to consolidate the Left Wing of the T.U.C. and organised it on a proper basis to co-ordinate the activities of the various groups in different provinces (P. 1878 (1) C.) The result of this consolidation was that at Jharia in 1928, our Party showed great strength and Joshi, Bakhale and company felt convinced that the days of their Trade Union leadership were numbered.

What happened, after our arrest, in the Nagpur Session of the Trade Union Congress is well-known. Joshi, Giri and Company left the Congress because they found that they could no longer exploit the organisation for securing free trips to Geneva and nominations in the provincial and central Legislatures. They therefore founded their own organisation called the All-India Trade Union Federation. At the Nagpur Session of the Trade Union Congress there entered one more section into the Trade Union Movement. It is the section of national Reformism represented by Jawahar Lal Nehru, Bose, Jamnadas Mehta, Kandalkar and company. Today the Indian Trade Union Movement is at its lowest ebb, it having split up into various groups. Attempts however are made to bring about unity of all the Reformist sections, to throw the revolutionary element out of the Trade Union field.

In the Delhi Session we entered the Trade Union Congress; the following three years went on recording the rise in our influence which supports our contention that the policy pursued by the W.P.P. in the Trade Union Movement (P. 111) was quite sound. And it was due to this policy and tactics, we succeeded in building and consolidating the Trade Union Movement that was in existence at the time of our arrest.

Speeches.

There are a number of speeches produced by the Prosecution in this case; and the learned Prosecution Counsel has read out a considerable number of isolated extracts from these speeches. Of these the majority are mine and I accept the fullest responsibility for whatever I said in these speeches. I shall try to explain some of the passages read out in this Court.

But before I begin to do so, I should like to make a few general observations. These speeches were made between the months of April and October 1928, when the General Strike in Bombay was going on. They all were delivered in Marathi such as would be intelligible to the workers of Bombay, who speak the Konkani dialect which is quite different from the pure Marathi spoken on the Poona side whence both these reporters came. Further Inspector Deobhankar, P.W. 278 has admitted in his cross-examination that spoken Marathi is different in some districts. I am of the opinion therefore that these reporters have not followed us properly, while we were delivering the speeches and consequently the reports, they have made are either the usuals Police reports, full of exaggeration and half truths, or totally perverse accounts other than what the speaker actually spoke.

Besides in the beginning the Marathi transcriptions were not put in; and instead the direct translations into English from their original shorthand notes were put in. These translations were faulty, full of mistakes and passages after passages were scratched from these original reports. Your Honour having been convinced that they would not be proper evidence, got the original shorthand notes transcribed into Marathi. This transcription was done nearly two years after the shorthand notes were taken down; therefore the correct transcription of those shorthand notes after such a lapse of time is not possible. And I stick to the view in spite of the boast of P.W.276 that he could read his shorthand notes any time.

The Court will also find that some of the portions of these speeches were omitted by him which he had admitted in his cross-examination on 15th January 1931. He replied, "The omissions I made were because I was writing a Police report." I therefore think that the reports are not reliable and cannot therefore in any sense be good evidence on which this Court should put any reliance. As regards the reporter Mr. Jacob Macwan (P.W. 273) I have to say a few things in detail. This reporter began to attend our meetings, not as a Police reporter, but as the reporter

of the nationalist daily in Bombay, namely the Bombay Chronicle. But the cross-examination of this witness has now thoroughly revealed that although he was working on a nationalist journal, in effect he was a Police informer and a spy. This will be noticed from the informative notes he added to his reports of our speeches, as for instance a note to P. 2245 about Krishanan being a Communist. I know this Mr. Krishanan was a reporter of another paper, called the Indian Daily Mail, who had then warned us about Mr. Macwan's being a Police reporter and spy. When the strike began Mr. Sirur, reporter of the Times of India, was engaged by the Police to take reports of our speeches and a handsome payment of Rs 100/- was made to him for a couple of hours' work in the morning. When we came to know of this fact, we made mention of it in our usual meetings of workers. Mr. Sirur probably got frightened and declined to attend the strike meetings; thereafter Mr. Macwan's services were engaged by the C.I.D. in the hope that he would be able to report these speeches, he being a reporter of a nationalist paper. But he was soon found out and when he scented it he stopped attending these meetings.

When this witness was being cross-examined, an interesting incident happened which further supports our suspicion of his being a Police spy. Macwan did not like that the report of his cross-examination should appear in the Press which would thoroughly expose him. And an informer once exposed does not become useful from the Police point of view. In order therefore to save this man from such an exposure we are informed that instructions were secured from the late Mr. K. C. Roy to the local Associated Press reporter not to send reports of the evidence of this C. I. D. informer. This journalist witness, working on the staff of a nationalist paper, but actually doing the Police work, both as an informer and spy, told all sort of blatant lies while he was being cross-examined; and why this man was saved from a public exposure is quite obvious.

The Police always employ such mean specimens of humanity and plant them into the revolutionary organisations. The crop of approvers in various conspiracy cases that are going on throughout the country is more or less a proof of the Police doings. In the early stages of the organisation of the Communist Party they tried to smuggle in their agents in the Communist Movement, but we shrewdly weeded them all out. We have got as a defence document (D 362) a report in handwriting of one Begerhotta whose house was searched on 20th March 1929 by P. W. 146. This document clearly shows that it was a report made ready to be sent to some Police officials. It speaks of alleged secret meetings and

discussions between several of the accused including Comrades Spratt and Campbell. The reporter also demands his fees from this official for whom it is meant, for the noble work this writer was rendering to British Imperialism. Mr. Begerhotta's search also proves that he had had connections with prominent Communists abroad, and it shows also that he was knocking out money from these connections. If Begerhotta had been a genuine Communist, as he was known for a long time, why was he not arrested and made to stand in this dock along with other Communists? The defence of the Government may be that he stopped his activities for some time before these arrests took place, but in that case I ask why was his house searched on 20th March? The answer is quite simple. Firstly they wanted to shield this man who is probably planted in the revolutionary movement to collect information for them, secondly by searching the house they assisted the men in getting some prominence in the revolutionary political circles which enhances his prestige and which the individual profitably utilises for his nefarious work. In this case Begerhotta's house was searched in order to get also further evidence against us. The modern methods of espionage through dancers and actresses have not yet been brought into active employment in India, though I can say that a beginning has been made. The case of Begerhotta however is a striking example of how the Police force their man into a movement like ours, and D362 is a proof thereof.

Having made these general remarks I shall now go to explain only those passages in my speeches which are quoted in the report of the Bombay Riots Inquiry Committee and which exactly occur in the Prosecution exhibits. I have once referred to this report in the course of my statement before. I shall not trouble myself by referring to all the passages that were read out in this Court by the Crown Counsel while these exhibits were being produced, in view of Mr. Kemp's remark only two days ago in this Court. He said: (I hope I am quoting him correctly) "These speeches are a drop in the ocean, but they will not be dropped." The latter part of his remark was due to my request to withdraw the exhibits if they had no value from the point of view of evidence, which the Prosecution Counsel indicated by his remark.

I shall now proceed with the explanation of some of the passages in P 1702.

"We shall carry on minor movements so long as the arrangements about revolution have not been made. Taking the weapons in hands we shall fight with you."

In the Bombay Riots Inquiry Committee's Report from this

very exhibit the following passage has been quoted which I think is the same as I have quoted above.

“So long as the details of our revolution are not properly arranged we will grapple with minor movements. A day will come when we shall take the arms and fight with you and exterminate you completely and drive away the Government, and the Labour shall assume the reins of Government.”

In this passage I was explaining to the workers that the time for the actual revolution had not arrived. Before the actual revolution comes I was trying to impress upon the workers the necessity of preparing and going through the intermediate stages of the revolution and the necessity of organisation of such a workers' revolution. Lower down below in the same speech there is a passage which reads: “Persons from the workers themselves must begin to think. Mr. Alwe has been trained from among the workers. Hundred Alwes like him must be trained here.” In this passage I was telling the workers the necessity of taking the Leadership of their movement in their own hands and with that end in view it was necessary that the workers be properly trained.

P.1709 M.T. : “If one and a half lakhs of workers in Bombay are unemployed we shall join “threat but we shall not fail to do so in fact”. The first part of this passage speaks of the necessity of organising the workers with a view to bring about a general strike which is a legitimate weapon for the workers. The latter part of this passage is misreported and the translations also are not quite correct.

P 1717 M. (1) T.: “If you do not want to keep peace do not keep it” up to “who are making efforts to break peace must not be allowed to do so.” This speech was made two or three days after the police had begun to harass the workers while they were going out of their meetings and some of them had become very impatient and made complaints in our meeting. In order to pacify these impatient workers we had to explain to them all things and persuaded them to maintain peace which we had succeeded in doing throughout the mill strike, because we knew that the time for breaking peace had not arrived. This fact had to be impressed upon a huge mass of workers and it was done in the best possible manner as this passage does.

P 1719 M. T. “A day will come when (we) shall take out your money.” “The workers have to go by this road.” Lower down below: “The Czar of Russia had so much oppressed the workers”. “There is no doubt that we shall do this in India.”

This also is not in my opinion the correct report. Some of the intervening words have not been taken down and the original Marathi does not read properly. The general sense in the passage conveyed I do not want to deny. I do maintain that we want to establish workers' 'raj' in India. And I was trying to explain to the workers how our Russian comrades had brought about such a 'raj' in their country. That required further explanation of the suffering and exploitation those workers were put to by their exploiters and that is done in the above passage in a manner such as will be understood by the workers. In the same speech lower down the passage reads "so long as our raj has not been established in our country, so long as power has not come into our hands in this country, so long as these factories are not owned by the workers, till then (we) are not to sit quiet, till then hundreds of small strikes are to be brought about. Our unity is to be effected, the workers' union is to be formed, the peasants' union is to be formed and the peasants and the workers are to fight hand in hand till the end." In this passage I was explaining to the workers how without the alliance of the workers and peasants the workers' raj could not be established. The establishment of workers' raj is the aim and the objective. But in order to achieve this end the workers will have to pass through several stages and these stages are mentioned in the form of organisation of the Trade Unions, the peasants' unions, and so on.

P. 1720 M. T. "You may say: what is the meaning of fighting with the police, beating the sahibs and (yet remaining peaceful) which means that the attack we have to make against the enemy is to be made systematically" and so on up to the end of the speech.

That morning I had received certain reports of police entering some of the chawls and beating the innocent workers. During the course of the strike all these complaints were regularly brought to us and detailed in the workers' meetings. When such complaints of police beating were brought to me I exhorted them to maintain peace and naturally the workers asked me how to do such a thing when police were beating them inside the chawls. In another speech you will find a reference wherein I have advised the workers to beat the police if they were to enter their chawls. I told them (the workers) that the police had no authority to do so. In this particular meeting I reiterated what I said before and gave them advice to maintain peace in spite of the provocation from the side of the police. I impressed upon the workers the necessity of carrying on the strike peacefully and systematically because if that peaceful character was disturbed there was a danger of our strike being broken. And although from time to time we advised the

workers and let them know their rights and privileges while dealing with the police, still we had also advised them and exhorted them to maintain that peaceful character of the strike which was done throughout those six months. In this particular passage towards the end I told the workers that if they wanted to make 'maramari' then they must be properly and systematically ready for such a thing. But there was no such question of making 'maramari' and therefore there was no need for making all the preparation spoken of. I certainly however say that we did advise the workers to beat the police if they were to enter private premises of the workers and beat them. During the strike such kind of police activity was a common occurrence and therefore this advise was essential and it controlled the police beating and such other highhandedness on their part. There was one police officer, Mr. Long, who was always in the habit of entering these workers' chawls and beating the poor workers. But when the workers knew what their rights and privileges were while dealing with the police Mr. Long's activities ceased, so much so that Mr. Long left the workers' area by resigning his job.

D/ 5. 11. 31

P 1714M. T:—“Though some persons, a few persons are killed, though a few persons die—do few (persons) die of cholera and starvation—even some if persons die etc. etc.” up to “underlings of owners.”

This passage is mutilated in reporting the speech. It does not therefore make any sense. What probably I was saying to the workers was that under capitalism the workers are starved and as a result they do die. They get no happiness whatever. I was then asking the workers, why not then die in an effort to be free. In any case they die, then better die in doing the nobler work of freeing humanity and changing the whole social order. The oppression of Imperialist rule and its allies, the Indian capitalists, I was impressing upon the workers, cannot be removed till the *raison d'être* of this oppression is destroyed. This could easily be done, if the masses were to rise in revolt in an organised manner, and the power of British Imperialism would collapse like a house of cards if such mass rising were to materialise. This point is emphasized in the latter part of the speech.

Communists do not hesitate to advocate violence. We believe, as all sane people do, that it is not possible to be independent by non-violence, much less is it possible to destroy the capitalist social order by doing penance and by non-violence. The capitalist State and social order is based on violence, is

maintained and will continue to be maintained by violence. It will have to be overthrown also by violence. I was acquainting the revolutionary working class of Bombay with some of these fundamental principles, nothing more, nothing less.

P 1716 M. T. "Some people will try to circulate false rumours among us, some people will try to create dissensions among us etc. up to "to pervert the things that have begun to appear in that paper."

In this passage I was announcing to the workers the advent of the 'Krantī' and was explaining to them as to why it had become necessary to start that paper at that juncture. Several newspapers in Bombay, which are generally supported and financed by the capitalists, were carrying on a virulent campaign against the Mill workers' strikes and spreading lies. Some of these papers used to circulate false rumours such as that the strike was over, and the strikers that had gone to the villages were misled by these reports. It was therefore found necessary to restart our paper the 'Krantī', which was done. The 'Krantī' thereafter was the principal paper of the workers, which published the most authoritative account of the strike and became popular among the workers. The other papers of petty bourgeois journalists were then publicly burnt by the strikers whenever any lies or false accounts appeared in these papers.

P 1721 M. I. T. "The workers have begun to see the road before them owing to the lamp of knowledge etc. etc. up to "you should do this thing"

In this passage I was impressing upon the workers the necessity of evolving the actual working-class leadership, which was our general policy. I have already explained in course of my statement on the G. K. U. how and what efforts our Party made in training the actual rank-and-file workers to assume the leadership of the workers' movement. We claim that because of this policy of our Party we find today several leaders in the workers' movement springing up from amongst the rank-and-file workers. Such a leadership, we consider, would be a real and fighting leadership for the workers' movement.

P 1726—M.T.—"And this help that we have received from Russia has been sent by those our workmen in our Russia etc. etc." "up to, 'we shall continue up to the end.'" At this time our financial resources had almost come to an end we received this money from our Russia as the report puts it in time. Several so-called leaders, such as Shiva Rao, one of the Round Tablers to-day, criticised and

even went to the length of suggesting that the Russian money should not be accepted. If a suggestion of that character were to be accepted, it would have meant the defeat to the strikers in Bombay. Mr. Saiva Rao and this type probably wanted such a defeat because they did not like revolutionary working-class movement to rise so that their leadership could be maintained intact.

When this money was received in Bombay the Police were trying to interfere, and actually this sum was withheld for some time in order to sabotage and break the strike of the Textile workers. Somehow or other information was received and the money was thus traced. There are many methods of strike breaking practised by the Police, the mill-owners etc. This one was one such method of strike-breaking. The passages refers to to our usual slogan of establishing workers' Raj which I have of course explained to the workers in detail and further impressed upon them the necessity of doing so, which under the peculiar circumstances they were put in they could understand better than many others.

P 1736—M—T. "Therefore instead of saying that meetings mean impediments when the strike is settled you must attend workers' meeting etc." up to the end of the speech.

This speech was made in the last week of September, 1928, when discussions were going on about the settlement of the strike. Ultimately the strike was settled on the 4th of October 1928. This passage particularly gives the general idea of the work to be done after the strike was over. I advised the workers in this meeting that whenever they went to the villages they must not sit quiet but explain to the poor peasants how they too are exploited by the Government, by the officials, by the Police, by the Sahukars, by the Khots, who form a complete gang of exploiters of the peasantry in the countryside. The workers therefore must rouse their brothers in the villages and prepare them for fighting with these exploiters. I also asked them to form village committees of the poorer section of the peasantry who would carry on this programme of the peasants' struggle. I reminded them of the divers experience of the six months' strike and also drew their attention to the necessity of doing away with the highest exploiting machine, namely the Imperialistic Government. I told them that the Police oppression, the oppression of the Sahukars, the oppression of the moneylenders, cannot be done away with unless and until they themselves took the reins of power in their own hands. I did this because I honestly felt that this is the only way for the workers and peasants of this country to free themselves and I do not hesitate to admit it in this Court.

P 1696 (2) M. T.: "When the strike is going on in India today..... one must kick them out."

It is necessary for me to explain the circumstances under which I happened to speak this passage. The strike had begun in the month of April, and when this speech was made nearly two months had gone by. We were at that time trying to collect some money for the relief of the strikers and the Bombay Provincial Congress Committee had promised to contribute Rs.4000/- to the strike. This promise was subsequently retracted because certain members of the Congress Committee opposed the proposal. The reports of these Congress discussions were appearing in the press and the workers naturally wanted to know what the matter was. We explained to the workers how the promise was made and how the promise was not kept. And naturally under these circumstances, when the workers were in urgent need of relief and money, and when the Congress had enough funds with them which the Congress Authorities refused to utilise for the workers this criticism happened to be made. It is further justified by our later experience. It was decided some time later to send a deputation of workers to Ahmedabad to collect money for the relief fund. These workers went to Ahmedabad and approached several leaders of the Ahmedabad Labour Union including Mr. Gandhi. These labour leaders refused to render any help to the workers' deputation to collect money, and when the deputation approached Gandhi he said he would not even contribute a pice. The refusal of such assistance to the workers, who were in need of urgent bread, does not do any credit to the Mahatma who claims to be the leader and who is parading today in England as the spokesman of the masses of this country. The workers' deputation left the Mahatma of Sabarmati in peace and started their own organisation for collecting relief for the workers. The workers of Ahmedabad understood the conditions of the starving strikers in Bombay, and in spite of the indifference of the so-called labour leaders and Mahatmas of Sabarmati the deputation was able to collect Rs.4000/- in Ahmedabad. When this deputation was collecting money an active opposition was started by the Labour Union there which tried to persuade the workers not to help the deputation in their object. All these efforts failed, because the workers understand the workers' case better than these leaders who in Ahmedabad are acting upon the principles of class collaboration. Mr. Gandhi and another mill-owner formed a committee to settle the trade disputes in Ahmedabad and the Ahmedabad Labour Union boasts that there occur no strikes in that place. How can the strikes occur when the workers' own trusted leaders are opposed to them and settle disputes by agreement (of course

generally in favour of the mill-owners)? The actual criticism in my speech is clearly justified in view of the criminal indifference of the Congress leaders, and the experiences which we and the workers in Bombay got clearly proves that the criticism was right. And the workers therefore should naturally think that these so-called leaders are not working in their interests.

P 1697 M. T.: "But the khadiwallas were alarmed to sanction the Rs 4000/-..... upto the end of the speech.

It is the continuation of the same criticism in regard to the attitude taken by the Bombay Provincial Congress Committee, and it does not require further justification or explanation.

"The second thing is about how to stop the persons that have faithlessly begun to go to work today..... many persons are making efforts to break the strike."

This passage mainly refers to the stiffening of the picketing of mills. The strike-breaking activities had been begun very actively, the paid agents of the mill-owners were engaging the services of 'dadas' (the professional goondas belonging to the class of 'lumpen-proletariat') and professional strike-breaking leaders like Mayekar and his gang. In certain parts some workers were induced to go to work and complaints began to come to us about these activities. It was naturally decided that the picketing ought to be stiffened. And I was explaining to the workers the necessity of such stiffening of picketing of the mills. I also told them that if the strike was to be broken at that juncture then they would not get anything and they would be compelled to go on another strike for which they will not be prepared. The workers clearly appreciated my point and the picketing of the mills became more efficient thereafter. We are charged often times with the prolongation of the strike, but I want to reply that if the workers had not accepted our advice or if they had not felt convinced that the advice we were giving about the continuation of the strike was correct, they would not have accepted that advice. The very fact that the workers continued the strike cuts off the foundation of the charge of prolongation of the strike.

P 1700 M. T.: "This much about meetings. Then the other arrangements made.....enlist in the army of the workers."

In this passage I was announcing to the workers the arrangements made in order to teach the drilling etc. of the workers' Volunteer Corps. I have explained in detail elsewhere our ideas and objects in organising this Volunteer Corps. In this passage also I make quite clear the immediate objects and the work this

Volunteer Corps is to do. Workers themselves were coming forward with the suggestion that a Volunteer Corps of the workers was quite necessary, because the game of breaking the meeting, the picketers, abusing the strikers etc. was already started by the hired hooligans of the mill-owners. It was therefore found necessary to equip the workers' movement with youthful workers drilled and kept in readiness to protect the workers' meetings etc. in case it was necessary which we did. I was the Captain of this Volunteers' Corps and the volunteers' organisation amongst the workers was rapidly growing. I have said enough on this subject in the course of my statement on G. K. U. to which your Honour may refer.

D/ 6: 11. 31.

P 1711 M. T. "If we workers set out merely with rolling pins and blow pipes" fight up to the end of the speech.

In this passage I was telling the workers how easy it is to achieve our objective when the workers and peasants organise themselves with the ideas and the policy that we had been preaching to them. The passage is literally translated and probably the whole sense is not conveyed in the translation. But the idea conveyed thereby is that the workers must organise and when that organisation is brought about the establishment of workers' Raj and driving away of the oppressors who are ruling today is quite easy.

P 1696 M. (2), T. The opening portion of the speech deals with and criticises Mr. Bole, one of the reactionary Labour leaders in Bombay.

Our policy with regard to these leaders was to expose them in the eyes of the workers, and once we succeeded in showing the real character of these leaders then we felt convinced that the workers and their movement would be saved from the dangers of their reactionary leadership. With this idea in mind I often during the course of this strike criticised Bole and his type. You will find me criticising Mr. Bakhale, another reformist leader and right-hand man of Mr. N. M. Joshi. When the strike began in the month of April or thereabouts Mr. Bakhale instead of leading the strike booked his passage for a trip to the Continent under the excuse of attending the Ghent Conference. What was wanted at that time was the actual work and the lead for the workers, who had begun their strike against the onslaught of wage-cuts etc. in Bombay, but this great leader and the right-hand man of Mr. Joshi instead of doing this undertook a trip to the Continent. We pointed out to the workers Mr. Bakhale's conduct and thus tried to expose the whole gang, who later had lost all following amongst the Textile

workers in Bombay. When concrete criticism is made and such exposure is made the workers clearly understand what type of leadership their movement is in need of.

P 1701 M (2) T. The whole of it.

In this speech I was voicing the grievances of the strikers. False reports were appearing every day in the newspapers such as the Times of India that the strikers created trouble here and hooliganism there, which had absolutely no basis. In fact the provocation to the strikers from the Police, from the hired men of the mill-owners and the strike breakers was so great that I would not have been surprised if any trouble on the part of the workers had taken place. What I was surprised at was that the workers were maintaining their struggle quite peacefully. In this speech I made a grievance particularly against the Times of India, in which paper columns and columns of propaganda against the strikers were appearing. I requested some of these newspaper men to give publicity to the other side also but these requests made from time to time were of no avail and the propaganda against the workers continued as before. I pointed out to the workers in this speech that this propaganda, the trouble from the Police, from the mill-owners and from the Dadas engaged by the mill-owners would not be stopped until capitalism and its rule were destroyed. This was the sovereign remedy for the workers which they readily understood and decided to work for.

In the workers' movement no camouflage would do. All these principles had to be explained to them as plainly as possible even at the risk of offending some of the sections of the Indian Penal Code.

P 1702 M. T. "The time will come when these persons travelling about in motor-cars etc. etc." down to "on account of which unity revolution will come about".

In this passage you will find me referring to the workers' wages of Rs 13 and Rs 15 a month. Just prior to the speech the mill-owners had issued a statement justifying these low wages of the workers on account of which I happened to criticise them and their luxurious life which these owners have been enjoying. I was criticising the statement and pointing out to the workers how the workers who create wealth are exploited and robbed by these idle owners who go about leading a luxurious life. The owners in their statement were attempting to justify these low wages in order to mislead the public and point out to them that the strike had no real basis, that the strikers had no grievances. This statement therefore naturally called for the criticism which I have made in my speech. I also pointed out to the workers how their comrades in other

countries such as China were attempting to overthrow capitalism and how they had raised their Red Flag against all oppression resulting from capitalism. I urged the workers to unite and be ready for hoisting such a Red Flag against oppression in our country too.

"We are carrying on the fight in this principle. Today we have made simple demand etc. etc." down to "the time is not today.

In the previous part of my speech I explained to the workers the general nature of the work to be carried on in the working-class struggle. Then in this passage I pointed out that our demand then was very small. We were fighting that strike for a very limited purpose i.e. to restore the wage-cuts. The whole passage marks a particular stage of the workers' struggle and points out that the workers shall have to go step by step by passing through all these stages. The struggle of the Textile workers in the form of the General Strike was only an initial stage and was not a revolution in itself as it is sometimes exaggerated in some quarters.

P 1704 M. T. "An extremely critical time has come on this occasion" down to the end of the speech.

At this time blacklegging had increased and we had to stiffen the propaganda in order that the strike might not be broken. In this speech I was pointing out to the workers the necessity of holding on and not allowing the strike to fizzle out. If the strike had broken at that juncture, then the owners game would have succeeded and the workers' miseries would have been increased because of the wage-cuts, the new system, the new rules etc. which the owners wanted to impose upon the mill workers. These questions therefore had to be explained to the workers and they had to be urged to continue the strike. This however had to be done with their consent and we often asked their opinions in our meetings. In this particular meeting you will find me asking a question to the workers whether they wanted to stick and continue the strike and a prompt reply came from the audience saying we shall stick." Towards the end you will find me exhorting the workers and reminding them of their resolve. The war referred to therein only refers to the immediate struggle, namely the strike struggle. That also shows how we did not do anything without the consent of the workers.

P 1716 M. T. "The owners expressed their consent, our people expressed their consent, owners begun to say etc. etc." down to "there was a crafty dodge in it."

This passage shows how we were conducting the strike and how we in the matter of the settlement of the strike did everything

and brought about the settlement with the consent of the workers themselves. In the previous strikes the leaders of the workers used to settle the strike as they liked and only issue a *fatwa* to the workers, namely "Go back to work." The poor workers then did not understand what they were fighting for, what demands were granted, what grievances were remedied but merely obeyed the leaders and went back to work to learn to their great surprise that the grievances for which they had gone on strike were there, that the oppression of the *mukaddams*, masters, jobbers, managers and so on was there, that the wage-cuts were not restored, and yet they had obeyed the leaders and returned to work. But the times now were changed. The workers had begun to understand what their interests were and I claim that the Party which I represent was mainly responsible for this change among the workers. Our Party made the workers understand their rights and privileges and therefore the old type of leaders disappeared like clouds in the sky. They could no longer face the workers under the changed circumstances.

We on the other hand, when the General Strike was settled, kept the workers informed of every stage of the negotiations and the settlement was brought about with their consent.

The education and the propaganda carried on by the revolutionary leadership of our Party was appreciated by the workers and the confidence that we enjoyed was entirely due to this new consciousness created by our Party. This passage shows it quite clearly.

P. 1722 M. T.: "We however will tell the workers that we are not ready to cause loss...from the audience."

I advised the workers to hold on and fight vigorously in this passage. The workers, as I have already pointed out had confidence in us and looked to us for correct advice on all questions relating to the strike. We gave the advice to them and also tried to ascertain and sometimes record their vote on those questions. This gave us an additional advantage and increased confidence in us because the workers felt convinced that their cause in the hands of our Party was quite safe and that there was no danger whatever of any deception being practised. They therefore acted upon our advice and fought in the struggle as vigorously as we advised them to do.

"Then the second law is that our Bradley and Spratt should be sent to their country...this is going on all over the world."

Obviously here I am referring to the measure namely the Public Safety Bill that was being discussed in the Assembly at that time I was explaining the object of this measure to the workers and how if that measure were to be passed into law our comrades

like Bradley and Spratt who were working amongst the workers would be taken away. In this passage I was also pointing out to the workers how Capitalism throughout the world was the same, and how exploitation and misery resulting from Capitalism was every where the same. I explained to them that even the Swaraj that is so much talked of is not the real remedy and in order to prove it I pointed out that in England there was complete Swaraj, there was a Parliament and so on, and still the workers' condition was no better. Parliament was an institution controlled by the bankers, by the rich capitalists, by the industrialist gangsters who exploited the British workers even though they had Swaraj. If Swaraj were to come in our country I told them that if that Swaraj or political power was not controlled by the workers then misery and exploitation would continue as it is today. The workers understood these points very clearly because they are the real sufferers from this disease of Capitalism. This passage points out the similarity of the Capitalist system throughout the world.

P 1724 M. T.: The last part of this speech makes reference to the women strikers' meeting which was organised for the first time after the general strike in Bombay was started. In the past women workers were neglected and they were not organised nor was any propaganda attempted amongst them. And during the strike we found out that because of this negligence the women workers were exhorting the men workers not to attend the meetings of the strikers etc. With a view to explain to the women workers the necessity of continuing the strike and enlisting their active support for conducting the strike in a better organised manner, we decided to hold the meeting of the women workers which was attended by hundreds of women. In this meeting we explained how women have to bear more responsibility of the every day struggle and life of the workers. The responsibility of household management, the responsibility of keeping the workers from the habit of drunkenness etc. were again on the shoulders of the women workers. Under these circumstances if the strike were to fail then we pointed out their responsibilities would increase because the wages of the workers would be directly affected and when that was done naturally the women would have to bear responsibility of the household management etc. The women's wages also would be affected if that strike were to fail. All these consequences of the failure of the strike were pointedly shown to them and they having understood the real significance of the struggle that was going on expressed their desire to assist in the conduct of the strike. After this meeting was over we were able to enlist the most active assistance of the women workers in Bombay in the form of chawl to chawl propaganda asking the workers to continue the strike till victory was won.

Secondly they enlisted themselves as women volunteers and started picketing of the mills wherever blacklegging was increasing. You will find elsewhere various references to the picketing of these women volunteers with a broom in their hands, of which the black-legs were tremendously afraid. When the G. K. U. was organised they became the members of the Union and some of them began to work as members of various mill committees. As members of the mill committees these women fought with the management quite valiantly in winning the partial demands of their women comrades.

During the last Civil Disobedience campaign some women from the bourgeois and petty bourgeois classes came forward to join the Movement. They were made much of and the press gave them booming publicity about their jail life etc. But when these women workers in Bombay were every day arrested, sentenced, beaten by the police and were going to jail, the press took no notice nor had they even anything to say about these brave women comrades of ours. No photos of these poor volunteers appeared in the press, and yet I am very glad to say that they were fighting and are fighting today for the workers. Their revolutionary enthusiasm did not die down as had happened in the case of these bourgeois and petty bourgeois women who had recently come out of their purdah during the last Civil Disobedience campaign. Even today in Bombay some of these women workers are still continuing the fight against all odds and capitalist opposition.

It is very necessary to carry on propaganda amongst them and its importance has been stressed in the thesis adopted in the Third Congress of the Communist International.

“Agitation by deed first of all signifies an ability to arouse a sense of independence in the working women, to eradicate the distress in themselves, and by attracting them to the practical work of construction, to teach them by practical experience that every conquest of the Communist Party, that every action which is directed against capitalist exploitation, is one more step towards the improvement of the position of women. The method which the Communist Party and its sections for work amongst the women should use, can be expressed in the following words; “from experience and action to a knowledge of the ideas of Communism and of theoretical principles.”

“In order that the section should represent organs not of verbal propaganda alone but also of activity, it is necessary that they should work in contact with Communist actions of the various enterprises and workshops, for which purpose the latter should

supply an organiser for the work among the women of the respective enterprise or workshop. Active propaganda by deeds means first of all the enlistment of the women workers to take part in strikes, demonstrations and other forms of the class struggle, fortifying and enlightening the revolutionary will and consciousness the recruiting of women workers to all sorts of Party activity, their utilisation for purposes of illegal work, particularly in despatch service and organisation of "Party Saturdays and Sundays," at which all women sympathisers of Communism, wives of labouring and professional men, in this way learn to be useful to the Party. The principle of propaganda and acts and deeds is also aided by drawing the women into all political, economical or educational campaign from time to time carried on by the Communist Parties."

This therefore clearly shows the possibility of the usefulness of the women workers when trained on proper lines and I am very glad to say that during the strike this phase of the struggle was recognised and a beginning was made. But for the active assistance of these women workers which were enlisted by propaganda, meetings and demonstrations, the strike would have failed much earlier.

P. 1729 M (1) T: "Communism does not stop by deporting... five and a half months."

I said this because there was criticism appearing in the press day after day. That Communism and Communist activities were on the increase and that they were engineering strikes etc. In this speech I was pointing out to the workers why Communism increases? I pointed out to them that it increases because the capitalist oppression is increasing. If the wages of the workers had not been cut, if the workers' grievances had been remedied, if the workers were given better wages, better conditions of living, in that case probably the workers' movement might have been checked. Capitalism creates the very conditions which bring about the workers' movement and Communism. In this passage I was impressing upon the workers this particular point. It was also said at that time that this movement started and the strikes began to take place because certain people from outside came in the country and began to organise these strikes. And it was due to them that these strikes were taking place. The workers when they read all sorts of silly things in the newspapers used to come to us and ask questions about them. We on the other hand in our meetings often referred to these discussions and propaganda in the press against the workers, against the Communists and Communism, and tried to correctly represent to the workers the

significance of these attacks. All this propaganda was engineered by the Bombay capitalists who were immediately concerned because of the Bombay Strike. The bills that came in the Assembly, namely the Trades Dispute Bill and the Public Safety Bill were also due to this incessant propaganda carried on by the Bombay mill-owners and the Bengal jute magnates and their allies in the country. And the Government being primarily their supporters obeyed and brought in these bills in order to satisfy these Capitalists.

P. 1729 (1 A) T.: This is in reply to a handbill issued by a mill manager one Ram Singh Doongar Singh. In this handbill it was falsely stated that the men working in his mill wanted to go to work on the same conditions as existed prior to the strike. He also had secured some upcountry men with whose assistance he was attempting to break the strike. He had kept about one hundred men inside the mill and adequate police protection was given to him by the Government. This handbill was a clear proof of the lying propaganda the mill owners had started towards the end of the strike. And this particular mill manager was also persuading other mill managers in carrying on the strike-breaking activities by spreading lies amongst the workers. I warned the workers in this meeting against such propaganda and asked them not to fall victims to it and continue the strike as firmly as before.

P. 1732 M.T.: "There is a territory in Russia named Ukraine..... we must carry it on till the workers' government is established."

News had appeared in the press that in Ukraine the crop of grain had been washed away by a great flood and there was famine there, and the Government had begun to feed 8,00,000, of workers by giving them food, clothing and all other help. In the usual course I gave this news to the workers and pointed out the contrast between the two Governments, namely the Workers' Government in Russia and our Government. The strikers in Bombay were starving for nearly six months. The Government had used all the police oppression in order to suppress the strike. They had done nothing in the way of giving any relief to these starving men. Naturally the contrast between the Government here and the soviet Government and its act in this particular instance was a very good illustration for pointing to the workers the necessity of establishing such a Government in this country. I did it and the workers understood it.

D/- 7. 11. 31

Anniversary of the Russian Revolution.

Now I propose to deal with the meeting held in Marwari Vidyalya Hall to celebrate the 10th Anniversary of the Russian Revolution.

P. 1685 is the report of this meeting which was held under the auspices of the W.P.P. of Bombay. I participated in the meeting and also spoke; this Police report does not contain a full record of my speech. The short note in this report which refers to my speech merely states that I advocated that workers and peasants in India must organise a revolutionary struggle and must not rest content until Imperialism is overthrown.

Many previous statements have effectively dealt with the question of the Russian Revolution, have explained its significance to the workers and peasants of India and stated why we as Communists made it a point to organise meetings and demonstrations to celebrate it. It is therefore not necessary for me to deal with the speech at length. But as chance would have it, I have come to this point in the course of my statement exactly on the day of the 14th Anniversary of this first great historical victory of the working class.

The mere fact that I stand here as a prisoner at the bar—a prisoner of British Imperialism—will not prevent me from expressing my revolutionary greetings to the workers of Soviet Russia who 14 years back on this very day overthrew the capitalist Government of Kerensky and carried out a successful insurrection in Petrograd under the slogan "All power to the Soviets of workers', peasants' and soldiers' deputies." No doubt the first decisive victory was won by the Russian Proletariat on this day 14 years back. But this victory would have remained an isolated triumph—nay, it might have even turned into a defeat—had it not been consolidated, strengthened and widened by the determined revolutionary struggle which the workers and peasants of Russia so heroically carried out against the interventionist attack of the Imperialist robbers of England, France, America and Japan, against the capitalist and landlord exploiters at home, against the counter-revolutionary saboteurs in the pay of foreign Imperialist powers, against the lying propaganda and machinations of the traitors of the Second International. For 14 years, with indomitable will and energy, the vanguard of the Russian Proletariat has carried on this struggle against capitalism—the struggle for the building up of Socialism—and has created a formidable and solid base for the International revolutionary

movement of Proletariat in the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics, which is a tower of strength of the oppressed people of the world and a standing menace to world Imperialism.

The victorious October Revolution of 1917 has shown to the Proletarians of the capitalist countries the path to power, the path towards the realisation of the ideals of Marx and Engels—the destruction of capitalism, the smashing of the capitalist State with its bourgeois democracy and the creation of a Proletarian State of the type of the Paris Commune and finally the building up of Socialism in the town and in the countryside. To the oppressed and backward peoples of the East, it has extended its hand of friendship and alliance in their struggle against exploiters—the robber Imperialism of the West. It has shown to the workers and peasants of these nations that their struggle can only be successful in alliance with the Union of Soviet Republics, [in alliance with the revolutionary workers of the Western capitalist countries and in bitter conflict with the capitalists and landlords at home. It has not only shown them more clearly than ever the path of national emancipation but also opened up the possibility of their direct development towards Socialism, avoiding the stage of capitalist development. In short, to the workers and peasants of the whole world, the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics is a glowing example to be limited—a living picture of their own and not very distant future.

The November Revolution has opened a new epoch in the life of the oppressed nations of the East. It was like a detonating spark which set aflame the gigantic conflagration of the revolutionary struggles of the exploited masses of the East. In its trail came a wave of risings and revolts of the colonial peoples of the East against their foreign Imperialist oppressors—in Turkey, Persia, Afghanistan, China, Indonesia and finally India. The national emancipatory struggle of the toiling masses in these countries has entered into a new phase since the Russian Revolution. It has assumed a positively revolutionary and anti-Imperialist character. It is steadily coming more and more under the influence of the Proletariat, although the process is not equally rapid in the different countries. The most significant achievement in this direction is no doubt the heroic struggle which the workers and peasants of China, under the leadership of their Communist Party, are carrying out against the feudal militarists and the counter-revolutionary agents of foreign Imperialists like Chang-Kaishek. This struggle, though carried out against heavy odds, is bearing fruit. Already 50 millions of Chinese peasants are living under the rule of their own Soviets. The Red Flag of the November Revolution is today flying over a territory as large as France. The echo of the November Revolution has penetrated into the farthest corners of the world.

The workers and peasants of India too will not lag behind. In spite of British Imperialist repression, in spite of the betrayals of the nationalist bourgeois leaders, they too will advance, under the leadership of the Proletariat and its Party, along the path of the November Revolution, overthrow the power of British Imperialism and establish the federal workers' and peasants' Soviet Republic of India.

During the last 14 years the Soviet Union has been continually gaining strength and stability. During the same 14 years the capitalist world has been stagnating and declining. Today the capitalist world is in the grip of a severe economic crisis. Production is declining, trade is dwindling; unemployment has reached unheard-of limits. The capitalists are trying to retrieve the position by savage wagecuts, retrenchment in social insurances and by the intensification of the brutal repression against the colonial peoples. In this dismal picture of chaos and crisis the U. S. S. R. stands out as a solitary bright spot, as the beacon light of hope to the workers and peasants of the whole world.

In spite of what the contemptible renegades of the Second International may say about the Soviet Union, the workers of Russia have shown to the world that they can build up Socialist industry and Socialist agriculture on a gigantic scale without the aid of capitalists and landlords. They have built up the higher and truer democracy without your bourgeois democratic Parliamentary institutions. They have shown us in practice that the only correct way to realise Socialism is through the Dictatorship of the Proletariat, through the Soviet power. In the words of Lenin:

"Let contemptible renegades hailed by the bourgeoisie and Social Chauvinists slander our Soviet constitution for depriving the exploiters of the suffrage. This will only serve to widen the breach between the revolutionary workers of Europe and the Scheidemanns and Kautskys, Renudals and Longuets, Hendersons and MacDonalds, and the old leaders and old betrayers of Socialism. This is in itself a good thing."

The path of the November Revolution is the path of progress and evolution. If toiling humanity is to be saved from the ruin and stagnation which threaten it under capitalism it must follow the November path. Lenin confidently declared:—

"Despite conditions of incredible difficulty and the fact that the Socialist revolution has made its first appearance in history in a country with a low cultural level, despite all this the Soviet power has already gained recognition from the workers in other

countries. The workers understand that, however difficult may be the inauguration of the New Order, however great the setbacks and even defeats falling to the lot of individual Soviet Republics, no power on earth will be able to turn humanity backwards."

There is no turning back. Workers and peasants of all countries have to march forward to their November and so have the workers and peasants of India. That is why we celebrate the Anniversary of the November Revolution. That is why we instil into the workers the significance of the November Revolution. The Russian workers have given the lead to the workers of the rest of the world; that is why we send revolutionary greetings to their representatives on the 14th birthday of the First Workers' Republic of the world.

P. 1691: This seems to be the report of the speech delivered by Mr. Ryan in the Jinnah Hall on 3rd January 1929. P. W. 180 Mr. B. R. Mankar notes the fact that the lighting arrangement in the Hall was not adequate, and I do not know whether this witness was able to take down the report correctly. Mr. B. G. Horniman had promised to preside over the meeting, but he did not turn up, and I opened the proceedings of the meeting introducing the lecturer Mr. Ryan to the audience. Mr. Ryan's speech was very lucid and attentively listened to by the audience because the subject matter of the lecture was his personal experience in Soviet Russia.

In India due to heavy censorship and precautions on the part of the Imperialist rulers very little news is allowed to enter regarding Soviet Russia and her great experiment that is going on. And Mr. Ryan's personal experiences naturally drew the greatest attention from the public who are interested in having first hand information about Soviet Russia. In fact the lecture was arranged by me at the special request of several friends and members of the public who were anxious to have information about Soviet Russia. I have referred to the lying propaganda of the news agencies and pointed out that such propaganda is not only conducted by the foreign news agencies alone but even by newspapers like the "Evening News" and the "Times of India" in the city of Bombay. I had referred to specific incident about which false news had appeared in that day's issue of the "Evening News" and had contradicted it.

The public interest in the lecture which I have talked about can be seen from the number of questions that were put to Mr. Ryan at my special request to the audience.

P 1684: This is a report of a public meeting held on 15th September at the Marwari Vidyalya Hall to welcome comrade Shaukat Usmani on his release from jail. I was invited to attend

this meeting and was asked also to speak. Comrade Shaikat Usmani who had spent four years in the jail had come out and we thought that it was our duty to welcome our comrade who had suffered for the workers' cause. The Magistrate in his Committal Order has remarked in this connection that I was speaking from the platform of the Communist Party even when I was not a member of that Party. I do not think that there is anything strange about it. It is the accepted practice that public men are invited to speak on special occasions even though they are not members of the particular organisation. I was interested in the workers' movement; so was comrade Usmani, and when I was asked to speak I was very much pleased to do so as I felt that I was doing my duty.

At this meeting the subject of comrade Saklatwala's passport which was then a topical matter, was discussed and I think a resolution on that subject was moved condemning the action of the Government in refusing a passport to him to visit his motherland. The refusal of passports to persons connected with revolutionary activities is one more method of preventing the linking up of the revolutionary movements of the working class. You will find in the records of this case several such instances. And the main object of refusing passports to such individuals was not to allow the movement of the Indian working class to be linked up with the revolutionary movements of the workers of other countries.

In this speech I am reported to have exhorted the people to follow the activities of the Communist Party and the Workers' and Peasants' Party and ask them not to believe in the lying propaganda which was engineered to frighten the people coming round these Parties. The "Times of India" The "Statesman" and other pro-Imperialist papers were pouring out articles and propaganda against these revolutionary parties of the working class and were trying to hoodwink the public with the idea of frightening them. In my speech, I exposed the propaganda and the object of it, quite clearly and exhorted my audience to follow the activities of these organisations.

At that time it was only the beginning of the wave of the workers' movement that came like a whirlwind in the following years. Our Parties were beginning to make determined efforts in order to put life into the workers' movement and what followed in the next one or two years was mainly due to the determined efforts of these Parties of the working class.

P. 2238: This is a report of a speech delivered by me on 15th May 1928 in the strikers' meeting held at Nagu Sayaji's Wadi and reported by Mr. Macwan (P. W. 273). I have already spoken

about this witness at length. Before I explain certain passages I would like to say something about the knowledge of this witness and his capacity to report Marathi speeches. Mr. Macwan is a Gujrati gentleman and his mother tongue is also Gujrati which he has admitted in his cross-examination. It is also pointed out in the cross-examination of the Marathi reporters that the dialect spoken in these meetings of the strikers was difficult to follow even for a good Marathi knowing reporter. I therefore maintain that Mr. Macwan was not able to understand and follow the speeches in these meetings. His reports therefore, whatever they are, are his own notes and I think they are totally unreliable. It was brought on record in the re-examination of this witness that he knew 'bible' Marathi and I might say that 'bible' Marathi is no Marathi at all and is entirely different from what was spoken in these meetings. With these remarks I shall now explain one or two points from these reports of this witness.

"The mill-owners considered the strikers as dismissed... .. going to bring workmen to work in their mills?"

This point I think was touched in the speech because the mill-owners had posted certain notices on the notice boards of various mills in which it was announced to the workers that if they did not turn up within a specified time then they would be considered as dismissed. This was a dodge on the part of the mill-owners to frighten the strikers and to coerce them to break the strike and come to work. We had to explain such tricks of the owners on various occasions during the course of the strike. Some of the workers did at first get frightened at these notices and brought us complaints with regard to them which we discussed openly in the meetings. Notices of this character were put up and various types of other tricks were played but all these were exposed by us and all of them failed in the achievement of their object. The notice that I was referring to in my speech was one of that character. The following two passages refer to our short sketches of our careers that had appeared in the "Evening News." In these sketches the "Evening News" had attempted to sling as much mud at us as possible and we had to reply all that criticism directed against us by the "Evening News" in this meeting. That is how I happened to make reference to it. The next point was that certain news articles criticising even a moderate like Joshi had appeared in the "Times of India" and I pointed out to the workers that the criticism of a moderate like Joshi in the "Times of India" would be nothing compared to the criticism of ourselves. Then I come to the strike breaking activities of several men like Mayekar and his gang. He had at that time started a vigorous campaign with the financial assistance that he was receiving from the mill owners and

we had to warn the workers against all such attempts made by the mill-owners and their hirelings. In the end it is reported that a copy of the "Times of India" was burnt amidst cheers and jeering. When I exposed and referred to the propaganda of the "Times of India" I was explaining to the workers from that paper which was in my hand. The workers sitting just round about me felt very much enraged and took the copy from my hand and burnt it in order to express their wrath against such lying propagandist papers.

P. 2246: Our usual practice was to take note in these meetings and publicly criticise, discuss, and repudiate all that was appearing in the newspapers. We also used to explain to the workers the view points of sympathisers, independent critics and our enemies, whatever they wrote or said with regard to our strike, because we felt that that was the most effective way of educating the workers and making them think independently for themselves. In these speeches you will find us making references to various subjects affecting the interests of the workers and referring to a number of speeches made by either the President of the European Association, or the Presidents and Secretaries of the various Chambers of Commerce whose interests were immediately and primarily affected because of the workers' strike in Bombay. You will find me making references to some scathing criticism from the late Mr. Langford James, who then was the President of the European Association, Calcutta Branch. That morning certain newspapers had reported that Nimbkar and myself had visited the Mill-Owners' Association and opened negotiations without our being invited. According to our usual practice, as this news was false and without any basis, I was repudiating it in the first paragraph of the speech. In certain papers it was reported that the registered Trade Unions and their representatives only were to be invited to start negotiations of the strike. This also I thought was a trick in order to exclude certain representatives of the workers and I explained it to the workers in that light as I understood it then. In the last paragraph of the speech you will find me referring to the discussions that were going on with regard to constitution-mongering and this reference is obviously to what was later known as the unfortunate Nehru Committee Report, which the authors of that report themselves had to shelve. I was pointing out to the workers that this constitution-making will not affect their lot in any way, and that these makers of constitution and talkers about it were not the real representatives of the workers who could authoritatively speak on their behalf. I concretely showed them how they had no interest in their struggle which these workers were fighting for months and how none of these so-called Swarajist leaders had ever cared to inquire about them. I showed to them that in order to

speaking on their behalf they must organise their own political party which was the Workers' and Peasants' Party, and which had authority to speak on their behalf, because this Party alone was working in the interest of the workers and peasants of this country. In the last few lines I was impressing upon the workers the necessity of capturing political power by wresting it from the hands of the capitalist exploiters and the Imperialist rulers.

D/-12.11.31

The Kranti.

When the Workers' and Peasants' Party of Bombay was started the first thing that we felt it necessary to do was to start our own paper, because the capitalist propaganda against the W. P. P. was so strong and our Party was so much misrepresented that we had to start our own paper. And accordingly on 7th May, 1927 the Kranti was started as a weekly paper with Comrade Joglekar and myself as joint-editors. The paper was an official organ of the W. P. P. up to the time of our arrest and it never was a personal or proprietary concern of any individual. The views represented in this paper were the views and the policy of the W. P. P. which we wanted to propagate amongst the workers.

The capitalist press generally considers it its duty to misrepresent the workers' point of view and give distorted news about the working-class activity, views and policy. It was very necessary that a Party like ours should have an organ like the Kranti which correctly represents its views and gives correct working-class news to the workers, and I am very glad to say that the Kranti fulfilled its mission from the very start and its continuing it even to-day.

The Times of Indian and other Anglo-Indian papers have times without number vilified the workers' papers like the Kranti and the views represented. But in spite of all this propaganda and vilification the workers' papers like the Kranti will continue to give the revolutionary lead to the growing workers' movement in this country.

As editor of the paper in 1927 I accept the fullest responsibility for whatever appeared in the paper. There are various articles in the paper which I could have explained to the Court but I consider it waste of time and I therefore do not want to go into further details with regard to them.

Q. The following evidence relates to your connection with the C. I. P: P 1232, 1143, 989, Kranti of 4. 6. 27 and 11. 6. 27., P 1084, 1287 (1), (3), 1946, 1295, 1300, 1303, 1296, and 1297. Have you anything to say about this evidence ?

A. *The Communist Party of India.*

I have already told this Court that I was a member of the Communist Party of India at the time of my arrest. The C. I. P. was an open Party and worked also openly and legally. This case has been launched, as we all know, in order to illegalise the the Communist Party of India and the Communist Movement in this country, although Communist Parties exist and work quite openly in other parts of the British Empire as well as other capitalist countries such as Germany, France, Austria etc. I have nothing to say about the exhibits put to me in this connection. Communists never discuss Party matters outside their Party meetings and this Court has no right to expect me to explain those documents which are alleged to relate to Party matters. I therefore do not admit any such documents as fall within the above mentioned category. I have already explained P1684 and P 1946 (1) in the course of my statement.

Q. The following evidence may be described as relating to your connections:—P 1472, 1967, 146, 459, 645, 1830, 971, 1225, P. W. 269, P. 746, P. 989, Kranti of 13.11.29. Have you anything to say about this evidence ?

Connections.

A. I have admitted that I was a member of C. P. I. and the W.P.P.; I was also connected with and actively worked in the Trade Union Movement. As a member of the C. P. I. and the W.P.P. I would naturally have connections with my comrades who associated with those Parties I regard it a proud privilege to be connected with them and fight hand in hand with revolutionary determination to achieve the lofty ideal, namely the ideal of the establishment of Communist society. As for as I am concerned I have not the slightest hesitation in admitting those connections. I have nothing to say about the exhibits in this connection.

Q. If there is any other evidence which I have not put to you or anything else in which you have to give an explanation you may now do so.

A. *International White Terror.*

I have dealt with various incidents which have taken place during the course of "the fair conduct of this trial" which would go to show that all the fairness that has been shown in this case has been entirely in favour of the Prosecution—the representatives of the Imperialist Government. This case is but a fraction of the White

Terror that is practised against the struggling Proletariat throughout the world. We, who are in this dock, are but a few individuals from amongst the thousands and thousands of fearless fighters for the cause of the working class who are being imprisoned and executed by the jailers and hangmen of Imperialism all over the world. Thanks to the onward march of the working-class movement of the world, thanks to the victory of the Proletariat in one country, the mass demonstrations against these manifestations of International White Terror are also assuming an International character.

We have on record one such world-wide and gigantic demonstration against the most dastardly murder of two Italian working men Sacco and Vanzetti to which I have already referred in the course of my statement and explained how I myself had the honour of being closely associated with the demonstration in Bombay in 1927. I refer your Honour to P 1363 which is a pamphlet issued by me on behalf of the Workers' and Peasants' Party of Bombay. In this pamphlet we find the last statements of these victims of White Terror. Then we have P 2311 which also I have explained in the course of my statement.

The late Mr. Langford James explained to this Court that the reasons for celebrating the anniversary of the execution of Sacco and Vanzetti is to "laud them as martyrs to the cause of Marxism and Leninism." Had the learned Counsel taken care to read through the exhibits he has filed a slight inexactitude in the statements could have been found. In P 1195 on page 194 you will find the most harrowing account of electrocution given by an eye-witness.

The last words of Vanzetti according to this account were "Long live anarchy" which is surely not a Marxist or a Leninist slogan.

The point of the demonstration was not whether Sacco and Vanzetti were Marxists, Leninists or Anarchists. The whole point was to demonstrate to the workers of the world, how the most cultured, the most civilised capitalism of the world—I mean the American capitalism—deals with working men who dared to agitate and organise against its barbarous system.

The suffering of Sacco and Vanzetti through seven long years of trial, and their subsequent brutal execution is an episode typical of the most barbarous and brutal aspect which bourgeois White Terror has assumed since the victory of the Russian Revolution.

No doubt the years 1848 and 1871 are characterised by the most bloody orgies of the counter-revolution of the landlords and the bourgeoisie. The history of Baden and Hungary in the June days of 1848 is written with letters of blood—bloodier still is the tale of the May Days 1871—of days of counter-revolution which followed the victorious March days of the Paris Commune.

But all the terror of 1848 and 1871 has faded in the background in comparison with that which now runs amuck in all the capitalist countries since the glorious victory of the working class in October 1917. The despised Proletarians have proved their capabilities not only to rule but also to reconstruct society on a new basis. The masters of the world are therefore aghast at this sight. They are aghast at the prospect of their own power approaching very fast its end.

Four years of starvation and misery entailed by the Imperialist war brought in its train workers' revolutions and risings in the countries of Central Europe. These revolutions and risings were drowned in the blood of the workers. Thousands of workers were killed in action, murdered in prison cells and executed. The toll which the bourgeois White Terror took from the working class is simply astounding.

We find some amazing figures for this period (Inprecorr, 1st March 1928, P 1486). Number of victims of the White Terror in Hungary is 15,000, in Germany 15,000, in Rumania 15,000 to 20,000; in Finland 65,000. In Russia in the part temporarily occupied by the Whites 10,000 were killed. In China about one lakh of workers have been barbarously butchered by the feudal militarist henchmen of Imperialism. In the period 1925 to 1927 about 861,591 have been murdered and 12,504 executed by the agents of capitalism and Imperialism in the whole world.

In the same exhibit we find more recent statistics. On page 2300 in the same issue we find the following:

“ The International Red Aid has recently published statistics of the victims of International White Terror and bourgeois class justice covering the period of the first half of the year 1928. These statistics are compiled from the reports and telegrams published in the bourgeois press, which it should be remembered, does its best to minimise the extent of the brutality of White Terror. Between 1st January and 30th June 1928 10,377 revolutionaries were killed, 13,107 were tortured, 36,765 arrested, 356 banished, 22,394 workers' quarters and offices etc. searched, 995 prohibition orders for meetings and organisations and 478 newspapers and books suppressed; there were 907 trials involving 6,603 workers and

peasants of whom 3,395 were condemned to death, 30 transported for life and the rest were sentenced to various terms of imprisonment. ”

“ During this period there were 42 hunger strikes against the barbarous Jail regulations involving 960 prisoners. ”

“ These figures cover British Empire, China, U.S.A., Italy, Germany, France, Yugo Slavia, Czecho Slovakia, Bulgaria, Greece, Poland, Japan, Mexico and Nicaragua. ”

Thus White Terror is not merely a counter blast to the upsurge of the revolutionary wave of the working-class after 1917. It is not a temporary phenomenon characteristic of the post-war period. It has been an inseparable characteristic of bourgeois rule right from its very inception. Even in the period of bourgeois revolutions—the great French Revolution and later 1848 the bourgeoisie has not flinched back from throttling in blood the revolutionary onrush of its own working-class allies who dared to push the revolution further. (P. 1220 page 25).

Today the White Terror has become a permanent weapon in the hands of the bourgeoisie. It needs no background of revolutions and risings. In some countries of Europe like Italy and Poland it had constituted itself as a permanent military dictatorship of the capitalist class. This permanent form which White Terror had attained in these countries is known as “ Fascism. ”

If you turn to P. 1195, on page 136 you will find a proclamation of a Conference of the Society of Friends of Soviet Russia. This is not a Communist body. Professor Albert Einstein and Henry Barbusse are among its patrons. This proclamation says: “ Fascist Italy is a country of the most gruesome terror in the whole of Europe, in the whole of the world. Not only are thousands and thousands of workers, intellectuals, Communists, Social Democrats bourgeois moderates at present slowly rotting in her jails—but what is far worse—these defenceless prisoners are subjected to most horrid methods of torture and imposition. ”

“ Hundreds of prisoners as well as intellectuals have been beaten in their cells till they bled, many have been crippled, dozens have been removed to prison hospital nearly half dead. Others have lost their reason under the most insufferable torture they were subjected to; many have succumbed to these tortures in their cells. ”

“ Fascist terror continues to rage in the same frantic manner. The life of over 6,000 political prisoners and deportees is in daily danger. ”

In the capitalist countries where Fascism had not constituted itself as a ruling party, it is nevertheless present in the form of organised corps and hands of hirelings of capital ever ready to fling themselves at the throat of the working-class at the slightest signal from their masters. Such is the case in Germany, Austria and France. The "Lynch Terror" of America is also a form of the Fascist Terror. In England the Fascist bands were in readiness to rush at the workers at the time of the general strike.

Fascism has become an international phenomenon in all capitalist countries.

White Terror in India.

In India the Imperialist rule was established and is being maintained on the strength of British bourgeois terror. What is known as the Indian Mutiny was not a mere sepoy mutiny nor was it solely a Putschist effort on the part of a few dispossessed feudal princes to regain their lost power. It must not be forgotten that the mutiny was preceded by an epoch of unprecedented colonial plunder and most brutal spoliation. The Permanent Settlement System with its hierarchy and parasites, its rackrenting which led the peasantry to starvation and ruin, the freed extortion of rents and taxes from the cultivators, the growing power of the moneylenders, all these had brought chronic famine, mass eviction and ruin to the huge masses of peasantry. Sir William Moore in his speech on the new Civil Procedure Code spoke of the events of 1857-58 thus: "Sale has everywhere ruined numerous hereditary proprietors and village communities, and everywhere it has changed them from a contented and faithful yeomanry into a disloyal body of cultivators ever brooding over their grievances and predisposed at the first opportunity to break out into lawless acts." (Quoted from Abhaycharan Das "The Indian Ryot, Taxation etc. page 577 Calcutta, 1885).

What Sir William Moore describes as "lawless acts" was in reality a heroic struggle of the peasantry against the biggest landlord, the East India Company and its hirelings. The struggle was no doubt foredoomed to failure, (1) because the peasant risings were isolated and could not be linked up under the undeveloped conditions which obtained at that time; (2) the peasantry had no ally at that time; there was no working-class and (3) the leadership consisted of reactionary feudal chieftains who could not promise the peasantry anything substantial.

The sequel to the mutiny was an unparalleled regime of

mass murders of peasants and soldiers. A most gruesome account of this Imperialist terrorism is to be found in the Minutes and Despatches of the contemporary officers and commissioners.

Edward Thompson's "The other side of the Medal" gives some disgusting extracts from the private letters of blood thirsty British Generals who veritably gloated over the "roasting of niggers."

Under the rule of Her Majesty the Queen and later under the rule of her amiable and "peace-making" son bourgeois terror assumed a stabilised character and legal sanction.

On the heels of the constitutional bourgeois movement for responsible self-government came the terrorist movement which sometimes goes under the name of "anarchist" movement. Early attempts of the national terrorists created a panic in the Imperialist camp and they began a policy of wholesale deportation under an old law—the Regulation III of 1818. Freedom of organisation and association was throttled by the promulgation of the Criminal Law Amendment Act (Act XIV of 1908), and the Prevention of Seditious Meetings Act (Act X of 1911).

During the period of the Great War a mass of applications of Regulation III of 1818 was sanctioned under the name of "Defence of India Act." Between 1915 and 1918 over 1200 persons were "regulated" out of their liberty. These persons were subjected to brutal methods of torture in order to extort confessions.

A crop of conspiracies were launched with alleged German connections. In this very town of Meerut a number of people both men and women were most brutally murdered by the Court Martial.

The conclusion of the Great War brought no peace to the workers and peasants but greater economic burdens. The prices of food stuff were steadily going up. The conditions of the masses worsened. There was a strike wave among the industrial workers. But Imperialism came down with a heavy hand on the strikers. During the great mill strike in Bombay the mill area bore the aspect of an armed camp. The strikers were shot down.

The panic stricken Government had already scented danger in India. The war-weary masses in Europe were rising against their oppressors. The 7th of November, 1917, saw the victory of the Russian Proletariat. The Imperialists wanted to guard India against the Bolsheviki danger and just a month after the victory of

the Russian Proletariat the Secretary of State for India passed an order empowering the ill-famed Mr. Justice Rowlatt to enquire into the revolutionary movement in India and to advise as to the legislation necessary to enable the Government to deal effectively with it.

The report of the Rowlatt Committee was published early in 1918; on the basis of this report the famous Rowlatt Bills were framed. These bills were meant to legalise and put on a permanent basis the reign of White Terror. They opened an era of torture and terror characteristic of the middle ages. It is unnecessary to go into the provisions of these bills in detail. The first one made the mere possession of seditious literature a crime punishable with two years' rigorous imprisonment; the second one made firstly a permanent provision for tribunals without jury, without preliminary procedure for committal, and secondly it gave power to the Executive to place persons suspected of complicity in anarchic or revolutionary crime under restraint. Further it empowered the Executive Authority to arrest and search without warrant and to confine persons so arrested without trial in any part of a prison or any place not usually used for the confinement of convicted criminals. Such confinement could be indefinitely prolonged.

These laws would have opened up an era of repression far more ruthless than the pre-revolutionary Czarist regime in Russia or post-revolutionary Fascist Terror in Italy. The publication of these bills was naturally greeted with strong protests, demonstrations and meetings throughout the length and breadth of the country. The wholesale deportation of the leaders of this movement was the answer of the Government. Hostile demonstrations and processions continued with doubled vigour. In Amritsar a hostile demonstration was fired upon, killing and wounding several people. This firing was the first signal to the subsequent events that followed—events that are written with blood and fire in the annals of the freedom movement of India. These terrible events ought to have exposed once for all the brutal and murderous character of Imperialist rule in India in the eyes of all those who hope for a "change of heart" and pray for the "substance of independence."

The massacre of Amritsar where thousands of defenceless unarmed people were murdered in cold blood and then left to putrefy in the open; bombing and machinegunning of peaceful and unarmed crowds of women and children in Gujranwala and Qasur followed upon by the six weeks of horrors of the Martial Law where captains, colonels and other cads showed their terrorism by

subjecting old men, women and children to unspeakable indignities and torture. During these six weeks of Martial Law 51 persons were sentenced to death, 46 transported for life, 2 sentenced to ten years rigorous imprisonment, 76 for seven years and 34 for various shorter terms of imprisonments. Several persons were made naked and flogged in the public streets; such was the Imperialist White Terror brought into action against the struggling people for their emancipation. These events were not mere anomalies or vagaries of a bureaucratic rule which can be cured by a few constitutional changes. These events unmasked the fiendish face behind the machinery of Imperialist rule which its minions will have us believe to be a progressive one. They have clearly shown to all those who care to see it, that the Imperialist rule is nothing if it is not organised White Terror. The monstrous exploitation of workers and peasants can be kept going only under a permanent regime and police terror.

The miserable mockery of reforms and partial amnesty that followed did nothing to ease the situation. The Non-Cooperation Movement, which was launched primarily against the reforms, assumed huge dimensions because it was reinforced by a background of universal economic crisis of the post-war period. Growing disparity between the prices of industrial and agricultural goods intensified the misery of the peasantry which is ever growing under the crushing exploitation of the Government, the landlord and moneylender. In sheer desperation the peasants rose against their oppressors in spite of the "non-violent gospel of Gandhi"; they rose in Chauri Chaura; in Oudh and in Malabar. Betrayed by non-violent leaders, almost without organisation and without a conscious leadership, these heroic fighters fell an easy prey to a ruthless reign of terror, torture and hanging that followed. 21 persons were hanged in the Chauri Chaura case, whole villages were surrounded with military who made free use of machineguns, several villages were razed to the ground. An orgy of murder and incendiarism organised by the Imperialist troops reigned supreme for several days in these provinces. The lot of the Moplahs in the south was no better. The blood-curdling account of the suffocation of hundreds of prisoners in the goods train van is too well known to be described here. Hundreds of Moplahs were transported to the Andamans, a convict settlement whose horrors outdid those of Czarist Siberia. The edifice of the feudal Imperialist State in India is reared on the blood and marrow of its millions of starving peasants and landless poor. This edifice is daily threatened by a volcanic outburst of an agrarian revolution. The Imperialist masters know it full well. They know full well that organisation of peasants of every kind and specially those directed against landlordism has to be nipped in the bud. They have instituted

a permanent rule of police terrorism and hooliganism throughout the rural areas. All minor offences against property on the part of the poor and landless peasants are dealt with a severity unknown in any other country except in Czarist Russia. Even in normal times the jails in India are crammed full of peasants and farm hands whose only crime is their unspeakable poverty. There is no country in the world where life sentences are so frequently made use of as in India. Progressive Imperialism has not only kept intact the old hierarchy of rural oppression--moneylenders, zamindars, taluqdars etc, but has ingrafted on the top of all this a system of most corrupt police rule.

D/ 13.11.31.

Soon after the collapse of the Non-Cooperation Movement a new element entered the political arena. This element was the working class. Formerly the wage struggle of the unorganised workers had been suppressed with fire and sword without the ghost of a protest from anybody. Now the foundations of a Trade Union organisation were being laid by men who were more or less politically minded, in spite of their reformism. The Imperialist masters who had grown wiser by the experience of the post-war revolutions of Russia and Europe, scented danger ahead. Their watch-dogs were lying waiting for the Muhajirins, some of whom had gone to Soviet Russia. They expected every one of these Muhajirins to return from Russia fullfledged Communists, ready immediately to start a workers' revolution in this country. I have shown elsewhere how these Muhajirins were arrested one after another and imprisoned for long terms in order to safeguard against their revolutionary activities.

After 1927 the working class first made its appearance in the struggle for independence as an independent political force. They demonstrated against the Simon Commission, for their economic demands and for complete independence, under the flag of the Workers' and Peasants' Party. In the strike wave of 1928-29 the strikers enthusiastically rallied round the militant Trade Union leaders; the persecution of individual Communists was now supplanted by mass terrorism against workers and strikers. Lathi and rifle charges against strikers were freely resorted to in Bombay, Calcutta and other places. Many innocent workers like comrade Parashram Jadheo fell victims to these murderous assaults of the Police. The 'Swadeshi' owners of national industry were glad of this help of the Police. Where the Police failed to break the spirit of the strikers in spite of the terrorism, they resorted to meaner tricks. Communal riots and Hindu-Moslem pogrom were staged

with the aid of the Police "agents provocateurs". I have already described this in detail in the G. K. U. section of my statement.

Another form of terror employed against the workers was to import blacklegs and hirelings from up country and organise night attacks through them on the strikers. The mean trick was tried in the Sewri Oil strike in January, 1929, in Bombay.

Besides this the Government sought to legalise its terror against the workers by attempting to pass repressive legislation directed against the militant working-class movement such as the Public Safety Act, the Trades Disputes Act, the Goonda Act; a discussion of these is on record.

No review of the British Imperialist White Terror in India can be complete without at least a brief reference to the unparalleled reign of blood and terror which was initiated during the Civil Disobedience Movement of 1930-31. The Civil Disobedience Movement was undoubtedly reformist in character. Its sponsors, the national bourgeois leaders, had planned it as a mass reformist demonstration, in order to retain their hold on the petty bourgeois following, which had been undergoing a process of rapid radicalisation since the end of 1928. The nationalist leadership, with the arch trickster Gandhi at their head, tried their best to localise the struggle and to direct the potential revolutionary energy of the masses in spectacular and futile demonstrations. It was a struggle, in essence, of the representatives of the bourgeoisie and a section of landlords against the revolutionary tendency that threatened to cut across the the possibility of a suitable compromise between British Imperialism and the nationalist bourgeoisie. It was a struggle of national reformism to retain its hold on the petty bourgeois masses as against the national revolutionary tendency; the national reformist leaders knew full well that they could not achieve even a few concessions for their class at the Conference Table unless they had the trump card of the petty bourgeois mass support in their hands. To achieve this, it was necessary to disarm and disorganise the national revolutionary tendency and forces which were contending with the Congress for the leadership of the masses. But in spite of reformist nature of the leadership and in spite of their precautions to localise the struggle the potential revolutionary energy of the masses found its expression in isolated spontaneous outbreaks like those in Peshawar, Sholapure, Kishorganj, Chittagong and Chirner. These outbreaks were put down by the British Imperialist Military and Police, by the indiscriminate shooting down of unarmed crowds, by the merciless belabouring of men and women volunteers, by the cold-blooded murder of women and children. While these atrocities were being committed, the Congress leaders instead of

calling upon the masses to defend themselves continued to preach non-violence and love !

Later on during the struggle the peasant unrest grew owing to the growing economic crisis. The Congress had talked time and again of launching a "no-tax" campaign, but had done nothing to organise the peasantry for the same. The threat of the growing peasant unrest was met by British Imperialism by a campaign of unheard of Police terrorism in the villages. The blow fell on the unorganised peasant masses, spreading demoralisation among them. The Congress leaders filled the jails, but failed to counteract this terrorism in any way. On the other hand the growing threat of an agrarian revolution brought them on their knees before Imperialism to accept the farsical "Truce" of March 1931.

The Civil Disobedience Movement was put down with the barbarous brutality characteristic of the Imperialist colonial regime, because in spite of the reformist leadership it unleashed the dormant forces of revolt of the exploited masses. Thus in Peshawar the appearance of the "Red Shirt" organisation, which was a radical Youth Organisation having contact with the frontier people inside the Congress movement, was a sufficient menace for Imperialism to come down upon the whole Congress movement as such there, and suppress it ruthlessly. The events that followed on and after the 23rd April, are too well-known to be recounted. The rushing of armed cars through the mass of demonstrators, indiscriminate shooting of unarmed crowds, killing several on the spot, martial law, shooting of the innocent women and children etc., which took place in Peshawar during those days is only a short summary of the ruthless White Terror which raged in Peshawar last year. These events were followed by the dropping of thousands of bombs from aeroplanes on the Afridi tribes, burning down several villages, and continuing Police terrorism against the peasantry and the volunteers of the villages round Peshawar.

While recounting the havoc played by the Imperialists in Peshawar one cannot forget the brave Garhwalis who are today rotting in jail. On this fateful day of 23rd April 1930 these brave soldiers refused to raise their arms against their unarmed brethren. They simply point blank refused to suppress the mass demonstrations by coercion and bullets. Not only the privates among these brave rifle men but even some of the officers also joined hands against the suppression of the Peshawar demonstration. The military might of British Imperialism quite naturally got stupefied and offended at the action of these brave soldiers who were subsequently tried by the court-martial and awarded inhuman sentences of life transportation. Captain Chappell said before the court-martial, "At the

order of attention he saw that their faces were white and their eyes were bulging out. I have not seen the men looking like this before." (Times of India, dated 6-6-30).

Although this action was mainly political its economic aspect cannot be ignored. Captain Tucker, Adjutant, speaking about the N. C. O. Harak Singh before the court-martial says, "Harak Singh replied, in the Army we are underpaid and have no *izzat*. India's Army is not for shooting our unarmed brethren."

According to Major Brunskill, Company quarter-master Chandar Singh accused had said, "We are not ready for killing young children and old people."

These quotations go to show not only their economic grievances but also their political consciousness.

The treacherous character of the Congress leaders has also been made quite clear by the incident of the Garhwalis. Just prior to this Peshawar rising the Working Committee of the Congress had called upon the soldiers in the Army to give up their jobs. But these very Garhwalis who acted upon the advice of the Congress and heroically fell victim to the Imperialist White Terror are not only thrown overboard by cowardly Congress leaders, but they are even condemned by them; the Congress leaders thus are supporting the British Imperialists and their brutal acts of White Terror. The Congress autocrat Gandhi while speaking about these unfortunate soldiers condemned them for their indisciplinary acts of not killing unarmed crowds in Peshawar. For the workers, peasants and soldiers of India this is the first taste of "Gandhian Swaraj" in the making.

Then came to outbreaks of Sholapur, where Textile workers and the town poor, who formed a substantial section of the Congress following, revolted against the continued Police Lathi-Raj in spite of the Congress bosses. A few policemen were killed and the Civil Courts and Police Chalkies were set fire to. Upon this the Military were called out, martial law was proclaimed and the whole town was subjected to Military occupation. Armoured cars paraded the streets shooting down innocent men, women and children promiscuously. When the streets were thus cleared, the house windows were fired at and women and children in the houses were killed. Mr. Rajwade, the editor of the 'Karamayogi', a weekly paper of Sholapur, was sentenced to ten years' rigorous imprisonment for publishing the gruesome account of the Military terrorism practised in Sholapur during the martial-law regime last year. Later three innocent persons were hanged and many transported for life.

The outbreaks of Kishorganj and Chirner, which were of an agrarian character, were also put down with unparalleled brutality. The barbarous sentences awarded to the Chirner accused are very well-known. As for Kishorganj even the nationalist bourgeoisie has to be charged with complicity in the ruthless terror which was initiated there. The Bengal nationalist daily, the Amrita Bazar Patrika, openly asked for Police and Military intervention to put down the rebellious peasants who were revolting against the money-lenders and their oppression.

During the later part of the Civil Disobedience Movement the peasant-unrest which spread throughout the country owing to the fall in prices and the inability of the peasants to pay their taxes was especially acute in U. P. and Gujrat. In both these provinces unheard of brutalities were perpetrated by the Police against the peasants. The confiscation of property, the destruction of utensils and homes, the merciless beating of peasants, violating their women folk were common occurrences.

The report of the Committee appointed by the U. P. Provincial Congress Committee to inquire into the agrarian distress in the United Provinces records a number of instances of Police and Zamindars' oppression in the U. P. villages. One such instance is particularly shocking. It is described in the report in the following words:—

"What happened at Pipri, Dandanapur and Sadasukh Khera on 30th May is not easy to describe. Ours is perhaps the only unfortunate country where people may perpetrate all this in broad daylight with impunity. It is alleged that "all houses in Pipri were raided, men were mercilessly beaten, even women and children were not spared. Kicks, canes, shoes, slaps, rods and fists were freely used." But this is not all. "Walls of the house were scaled, doors were broken open, chains and locks were smashed." One woman deposed, and she was corroborated in her statement by the Patwari of the village, that she was beaten and an attempt was made to thrust a rod in her private parts. And yet worse was to come. When the party was at Sadasukh Khera, a woman, Sukdeiya, wife of Angou Chamar, was brought before a zamindar from Dandanapur. The zamindar "ordered four of his men to drag her inside a house and commit a rape on her. Accordingly she was dragged inside the house and the four men by turn committed rape upon the helpless woman." (Page 75).

The Government and their machinery maintaining law and order operated against the poor tenants of these villages. The Zamindars' oppression and excesses were connived at by the Police

and the Government officials. Whenever complaints of these excesses were made, they were either connived at or the complainants themselves were proceeded against. The Congress report quotes many instances to support this callous attitude of the Imperialist Government and its officials. The following instance illustrates this quite graphically:—

“The tenants of Dhankuti and other villages made reports to the Deputy Commissioner and the Superintendent of Police, Barabanki and the Divisional Magistrate about the Zamindars' oppression and maltreatment. In reply to this petition section 144 was promulgated on May 5, 1931 prohibiting public meetings in 22 villages to which the complainants belonged. A few of the complainants were proceeded against under section 107 Criminal Procedure Code” (Page 79)

This is how the Truce terms arrived at between Mr. Gandhi and Lord Irwin were being carried out in the villages throughout the length and breadth of the country. And under these circumstances his luggage was being packed secretly to proceed to London to effect a lasting compromise between the Indian bourgeoisie and British Imperialism.

The oppression in the countryside by the zamindars and the police was not all. In spite of the so-called Truce British Imperialism was proceeding in a right royal manner with its policy of repression. Ordinance after ordinance was being promulgated. The Bengal detainees continued to rot in prison as before. The operations of the Criminal Law Amendment Act of 1930 are very widely made use of, and in order to make it more effective the Viceroy has just promulgated an Ordinance No. 9 further amending this Act to suit the convenience of the all powerful Bengal police. According to the provisions of this ordinance any person can be arrested and put into prison on mere suspicion. With such wide powers what mad acts the autocratic Executive is capable of can best be imagined. In Bengal today hundreds of people are arrested and without any trial continue to rot in jail as victims of White Terror.

The life of these prisoners in jail and in detention camps is not safe. This has been proved by what is now well known as the Hijli incident. In this detention camp nearly 180 detainees were harded together without trial; and they are looked after by a Commandant, Assistant Commandant and Inspector. At night all these officers stay far away from the camp and the Havildars and a few guards are in charge of the whole camp. On the 16th September last these guards opened fire upon the unarmed and helpless detainees,

killing two on the spot and wounding several of these persons, necessitating an amputation of hand in one case, causing a terrific shock to the people of this country. As a result of the Nationalists' clamour in public meetings and in the Legislative Assembly a committee was appointed to inquire into the Hijli firing incidents which has just made a report and has concluded the farce.

A cursory glance at this report will convince anybody that the whole firing was pre-arranged because of the existence of ill-feeling between the officers and the detainees; and in spite of the laborious efforts of this committee to shield the officers, their complicity in the whole brutal affair is quite apparent. This committee has come to the conclusion that the firing was "indiscriminate and without any justification" but in its efforts to save the officers who seemed to be behind the whole firing incident puts all blame upon the sepoys who probably were mere tools in the hands of their superiors.

The committee has recorded some very blood-curdling accounts of the firing of the 16th September. Not only were these men fired upon at long range, but the sepoys entered the buildings, brutally beat the detainees with lathis and bayonets, and after all this cowardly attack, in one case a gun shot was fired at close range killing the half-dead man. The committee has recorded it in its report in the following words:—"B. Tarkeshwar Sen Gupta was the detainee who was shot dead while standing on the upper verandah. Besides the gunshot wounds which were found on him by the Civil Surgeon of Midnapore, who held the post mortem examination, B. Tarkeshwar Sen Gupta had two other injuries on his head, and these two injuries, according to the Civil Surgeon had probably been caused by a blow. According to the Civil Surgeon they could not probably have been caused by a fall after the man had received the gunshot wounds. The injuries on the head of B. Tarkeshwar Sen Gupta could not therefore be explained in any other way than that he was hit by some one of the sepoys who had gone upstairs, remembering that B. Tarkeshwar Sen Gupta, according to the evidence, was a man who could not walk about with ease". (Report of the Hijli Inquiry Committee, Bombay Chronicle of 3rd November 1931).

Such is the White Terror practised against the Indian politicals inside the Indian prisons and detention camps by the agents of British Imperialism.

The openly brutal aspect of British bourgeois terror in India is combined with subtler forms of political oppression directed against the freedom of press, speech and thought. The repeal of

the Press Act brought no freedom of the press in India. Rigorous enforcement of the Sec. 124A makes all talk of freedom of speech and press illusory. There is no country in the world where such barbarous sentences are passed for so-called seditious articles and speeches. The ridiculously arbitrary nature of the proscription of books in India is amply typified by the recent instance of Dr. Sunderland's book—the major part of which was published in the form of stray articles in "Modern India", a Liberal magazine. Another instance of proscription is the book on India by Mr. Holton James entitled "I tell everything." Mr. James who paid a visit to this Court along with Mr. Brailsford came to know many details about this and we understood that he has devoted two chapters to the scandalous conduct of this case in his book exposing how British Imperialism rules in India to the people of America. Naturally the Government felt offended at this exposure and proscribed this book post haste. The order of proscription issued under S. 99 A of the Cr. Pro. Code is on record, which is another instance of rigour and arbitrariness of proscription. Both the leaflets which are declared proscribed by this order are on record (P. 763 and P. 769). The first one "Message of a Communist" is a very primitive leaflet calling for an organisation of workers and peasants. The second one is issued by the C. P. I. It deals with the Hindu-Muslim problem and demonstrates the futility of giving religious colour to political movements and advocates that no national freedom can be attained without uniting the masses on economic grounds. To put a progressive programme before the people, to make an appeal to place the political emancipatory movement on the sound basis of economic demands is sedition in India. It could not be otherwise in the eyes of the Imperialist bandits, who could only maintain their rule of exploitation by fostering dissensions among the various religious sects and organising communal riots and pogroms of the type of Cawnpore.

Another instance, which further proves their arbitrariness in the matter of proscription, is D 145 (3) "India and China". This booklet was declared proscribed by the Government of Bombay some time in 1927. After the trial and acquittal of Comrade Spratt I naturally thought that the book had obtained legality and the proscription order against it would be automatically withdrawn. I waited for some time for this to happen. However nothing of the kind happened. I then wrote to the Government of Bombay requesting it to lift the proscription order on the book. But the ban was not lifted in spite of the judicial pronouncement with regard to the innocence of the book and clean acquittal of Comrade Spratt. This instance clearly proves the arbitrariness of the proscription orders.

Unfortunately British Imperialism cannot place restriction on book production in foreign countries; but it makes good this drawback by posting in all ports clever watch-dogs well armed with orders under sections and sub-sections of the Sea Customs Act. P. 2489 is such an order against international political literature. It bans certain periodicals like the "Masses" and "Inprecorr", all past, present and future books of M. N. Roy wherever and in whatever language they may be printed; similarly all publication emanating from RILU, the World League against Imperialism and its branches are declared contraband. So far the order is quite clear cut. But the paragraph referring to the C.I. is very ingeniously worded. It says "All publications emanating from the C.I. or from any organisation affiliated to or controlled by or connected with the C. I." This ingenious wording calls for a corresponding ingenuity on the part of the Customs officers on duty who according to our experience have not lacked it. Two instances will suffice. The intelligent gentleman who produced the search list P. 1477 not only seized private letters, diaries etc but also a monograph on Michel Angelo and a Russian Grammar. Stupidity cannot go further. The obident official promptly handed over the books to the C. I. D. who on the other hand brought these books in this case.

The second instance is of P 1838-39-40 to which I have already referred. These are the books contained in packages addressed to me. They contained apart from other books Government publications like "Army Supplementary Estimates", "Army Memorandum of the Secretary of State for War" relating to Army Estimates of 1927, and "Russian Trade with Great Britain and U.S.A." But along with the other books even these Government publications were also taken and they were never returned to me. As I have pointed out I heard about them only when the lists were tendered as evidence against me in the Lower Court by P. W. 250.

We have not the slightest illusion as to the character of the Imperialist State; neither do we expect this State or its minions to encourage or even connive at the spread of revolutionary literature. What I do want to stress is the backwardness and retrograde character of the feudal Imperialist State in India which under the cover of suppressing the revolutionary literature is out to throttle the intellectual life of the country, to ban all freedom of thought and isolate India from the world. The Executive in India have unlimited and arbitrary powers of proscribing any book they please. In spite of the judicial verdict that a book is not seditious the Executive continue to keep the ban of proscription on such books. The Customs Authorities with the able assistance of the C. I. D.

can stop almost any paper or book entering into India. In India a police officers armed with or without a warrant is a legalised burglar. Police searches in this case have been a veritable scandal. I do not know whether it was their misplaced zeal or their wilful stupidity which prompted these intelligent guardians or "law and order" to rob private individuals and public organisations of piles and piles of books, papers etc. wholly unconnected with the case. This happened in spite of written instructions which were fairly clear. These subordinate officers were very probably warned by their superiors not to leave any important piece of evidence behind, and so to err on the safe side they brought the whole lot. After all who was going to question their authority? Does not the military might of British Imperialism stand behind them? Yes; it does; the adamant refusal of Gandhi's demand for an inquiry into the police excesses on the part of the Imperialist Government is a strong proof of that. If Mr. Gandhi had only understood the real character of British Imperialism he would do good to himself and to the national movement as well.

Red Terror.

The prosecution has given a most distorted picture of the Russian Revolution, and a gruesome perspective of "Red Terror". They have brought on record scandalous and lying propaganda against the Soviet Union in the form of books like "Bolshevism" by Candler.

It is asked that granting capitalist rule is based on White Terror, what do Communists propose? Do they not merely wish to supplant "White Terror" with "Red Terror"? Those who thus argue, conveniently forget that the rule of White Terror is the rule of the possessing few against the toiling millions. They forget that White Terror in some form or another has ever been in existence since the time classes came into being.

The proletariat takes recourse to terrorism in order to break the monopoly of the means of production which are at present concentrated into the hands of the possessing few, in order to smash the bourgeois State and to establish the democratic rule of the workers and peasants. In doing this it annihilates the exploiting class and creates condition in which it would be impossible for any exploiting minority to monopolise the means of production which rightly belong to society at large. Thus by putting an end to all exploitation, it paves the way to a classless society—a society in which terrorism shall have no basis for existence at all. In other words the terrorism which the bourgeoisie practices, is calculated to perpetuate exploitation and hence terrorism. The proletariat on the

other hand uses terrorism only to do away with oppression and terrorism once for all.

Communists do not believe in the mystical doctrine of conquering the world with love; neither do they believe in the imbecile principle of non-violence. They know full well that the Imperialist State is established by terrorism and it can only be overthrown by the organised terrorism of the toiling millions. The leadership of these exploited millions rising against their oppressors devolves naturally on the proletariat, because it is the most progressive, disciplined and organised class and is at the same time the most determined opponent of the capitalist regime. The proletariat alone is fitted to carry out the tasks of the bourgeois democratic revolution; it alone has the capacity to open the road to Socialism under its class dictatorship. Trotsky writes (P. 223):—"The man who repudiates terrorism in principle, that is repudiates the measures of suppression and intimidation towards determined and armed counter-revolution, must reject all idea of the political supremacy of the working class and its revolutionary dictatorship. The man who repudiates the dictatorship of the proletariat repudiates the Socialist revolution and digs the grave of Socialism." (Defence of Terrorism p 23-24).

Red Terror in Russia was an essential and necessary weapon in the hands of the proletariat. It was directed against the White Guards and the Imperialist Interventionists who were making determined efforts to drown the workers' revolution in blood. It was far less terrible and far less long-lived than the White Terror; because the latter is directed against the entire working class and is one of the main props of bourgeois rule. White Terror cannot end until the rule of the possessing few itself ends. It cannot end by annihilating those against whom it is directed; because in that case society itself will be annihilated. Not so the Red Terror. It is the weapon wielded by the proletariat in power against the parasitic excrescences preying on society at large. Its function is concluded the moment society is freed from the disease. Society can exist and develop much better without these capitalist exploiters.

A few facts about Red Terror in Russia. It must be remembered that Red Terror was proclaimed in Russia as late as 10th September 1918, by order of the Council of People's Commissars (P. 1176 page 583). What were the events that led up to it? What made it an indispensable weapon in the hands of the proletariat?

Immediately after the November victory in Petrograd and in Moscow, Soviet Authority was established in most of the principal

provisions of Russia. The decrees published by the Soviet Government, after its accession to power dealt so decisively with the pressing problems of the time that workers, poor peasants and soldiers everywhere spontaneously rallied round the flag of the Soviet. But the enemy was not yet completely annihilated. It was merely lying in wait and expecting every moment the collapse of the Bolshevik power. The bourgeoisie, Czarist Generals and White Guards were waiting for their opportunity; so were the Governments of the Entente. But these expectations of the rapid collapse of the Soviet power were not fulfilled, and the Governments of the Entente decided to take the offensive in collaboration with the counter-revolutionary forces in the country. They found a suitable lever in the Czecho-Slovakian army which was 60,000 strong. Millions of francs from the State treasury of France found their way into the hands of Czecho-Slovakian chiefs. Their armies began to act on 25th May 1918; local Soviets were overthrown. With the aid of the Czecho-Slovakian rifles the revolution of the Siberian and Ural proletariat was suppressed in blood. Hundreds of socialist revolutionary agitators worked in close cooperation with British spies and monarchist officers; they brought about a series of insurrections in the central provinces.

D/14 11.31

In August 1918 General Krasnov formed an army of 10,000 men mostly from Don Cossacks, Caucasus and Kuban. The British money was helping Denykin to form his 'volunteer' army. The British were also landing troops in Archangel. The Japanese laid their hands on Vladivostok.

Petrograd and Moscow were rife with conspiracies and plots, helped by the agents of the Entente (Lockhart Conspiracy to blow up the railway bridge leading to Petrograd. —Phillips Price. Pages 331-332.)

On the 5th September a social revolutionary fired two shots at Lenin wounding him; on the same day two Commissars of the Petrograd Soviet were assassinated.

It was under such grave circumstances, in order to defend and rescue the achievements of the first victorious Proletarian revolution, that Red Terror was instituted.

Phillips Price, a correspondent of a bourgeois paper, the Manchester Guardian, writes about this Red Terror as follows:—

"Conspirators could only be convinced that the Soviet Republic was powerful enough to be respected if it was able to punish its enemies. But nothing could convince these enemies except the fear of death; because all were persuaded that the Soviet Republic was falling. Given these circumstances it is difficult to see what weapon the Communists could have used to get their will respected."

"Nevertheless the few thousand lives sacrificed during the worst period of the Red Terror did not amount to a fraction of those millions sacrificed by the Imperialists in the European War." (Page 337.)

"These heroic measures were not slow in bearing fruit—it seemed that the tide had turned and that the Soviet Republic would indeed defeat its enemies. For the first time in history a working-class army had come into being, and had actually proved that it could fight and defeat, in the first round at any rate, the hirelings of its class opponents." (Page 339).

If we compare the total figures of the victims of Red Terror during the period of intervention in Russia with the heavy toll which the White Terror has taken during the same time in Central Europe and the Balkans, we find that the latter is nearly eight times the former. According to *Izvestia* itself, the total figures add up to 16,532 for the whole period of intervention (Phillips Price, page 337, foot note); if we add up the figures for the victims of White Terror in Central Europe and the Balkans for about the same time we find that the total comes to 135,000. Such is the havoc White Terror plays as compared to Red Terror.

One word about "individual terrorism" of the anarchist type. Comrade Hutchinson has exhaustively dealt with the subject. I shall, therefore, passingly say a few words about it. The Communists discard the weapon of individual terrorism because they believe that nothing can be gained by the destruction of individuals who form part of the State machinery. Communists aim at the complete destruction of the existing State machinery of Imperialism; hence they must rely on the strength, discipline and organisation of that class which alone can accomplish that task and erect its own State machinery in its stead. That class is the proletariat; its machinery is the revolutionary Democratic Dictatorship of the workers and peasants, which alone can guarantee the carrying out of bourgeois democratic tasks, such as independence from foreign rule, abolition of landlordism, freedom of organisation for workers and peasants etc. It alone can open the road towards Socialism. The Communists therefore agitate, organise and discipline their

forces on class lines only to prepare for an armed uprising of the toiling masses which alone can bring independence to India, freedom, land and bread to the workers and peasants.

In the early period of his work Lenin carried out a determined fight against the terrorist tendency in the contemporary Russian movement. He said, "In the beginning of our struggle we had to assert ourselves against the representative of 'Narodnya Volya' who considered politics apart from every workers' movement and degraded politics to a mere conspiratorial struggle." (Iskra, December 1900).

Lenin was never tired of emphasising the fact that "Politics is a Class Struggle." Our terrorists, who are nevertheless most intrepid revolutionaries, ignore this fact and divert their revolutionary ardour and sacrificing spirit into futile channels.

Bourgeois Justice.

At the very outset I have said that we do not expect justice from this Court or to put it more correctly we expect to get nothing but class justice. The spokesmen of the bourgeoisie often speak and write volumes about "justice" as an abstract quality, as an eternal verity. In this Court we have heard such phrases as impartial justice, a proper judicial atmosphere etc. Abstract justice, impartial justice does not exist, never existed and never shall exist so long as society is split up into classes.

The justice which is given in the Imperialist courts of India is bourgeois justice and is meted, according to bourgeois law. It could not be anything else; the State machinery is dominated and controlled by the Imperialist bourgeoisie; and as such laws, made by this State are made with a view to safeguard and perpetuate that domination.

In fact all legislation is class legislation. The spokesmen of the bourgeoisie admit this as far as the past epochs are concerned. They are willing to admit that the legislation of the feudal epoch was a class legislation calculated to safeguard the rights of the privileged aristocracy, they admit it because they themselves suffered under it. Mr. Jethro Brown quotes striking examples of such legislation from the past.

"According to Brentano all Statutes of labourers in the middle ages were framed with regard to powers and wants, of the feudal lords. The great statute of apprentices of the time of Queen Elizabeth, observes Jevons, aimed at establishing industrial slavery. (Principles of Legislation, page 184)."

Ask a bourgeois jurist about modern, i.e. bourgeois, legislation and he will unhesitatingly reply that it is based on social unity, on the welfare of the society as a whole, on liberty and equality. No doubt slavery in the old form does no more exist on the Statute book; no doubt every individual is considered equal before the law, at least in theory. Hereditary and personal slavery has for the most part given place to a new type of slavery—that of the industrial wage-earners.

The modern worker is a free slave. He is free as much as he is free to work on a starvation wage—if he is fortunate enough to get work; otherwise he is free to starve to death for want of work. But he is a slave of the capitalists who own the means of production and who alone can give him employment. If he dares to revolt against these conditions of wage slavery, the capitalist Government has legislation enacted in the name of the welfare of society—legislation which restricts his freedom of organisation and his right to strike and forces him to accept the dictates of an arbitration court dominated and almost always effectively controlled by capitalists. Laws like the Trades Disputes Act were not class legislation. Oh! by no means, they are enacted in the interests of the public at large!

Justice like all other things in bourgeois society is a commodity. It is bought and sold in so-called Civil Courts. Individuals are equal before the law but only in theory. In practice it is the Mahajan or Sahukar who triumphs over the debtor; the Zamindar over the tenants, the possessor over the dispossessed. The whole machinery of the bourgeois law courts is run in the interests of the possessing classes (A. B. C. of Communism, para I, page 229). It could not be otherwise. Civil legislation under capitalism is bourgeois property as well as feudal property so far as the bourgeoisie recognises it. It claims to protect the individuals; but in reality it protects the privileged and propertied few. It claims to preserve social order and social harmony; in reality it is there to preserve the bourgeois social order. When a bourgeois jurist talks of the rights and liberties of the individuals he always means the individuals belonging to his class. All the shibboleths enshrined as the principles of legislation are so many metaphysical phrases based on the denial of class struggle. They were formulated as so many slogans at a time when the bourgeoisie was playing a revolutionary role and had to mobilise the support of the masses against the absolutist rule of the feudal aristocracy. After the overthrow of feudalism these slogans of liberty and equality have been interpreted in terms of the exigencies of the bourgeois social order for the protection and defence of bourgeois property and rule.

Criminal legislation and justice, we are told, is based on the "social will". In reality they embody the will of the ruling class and what is more their vengeful sentiments.

"The great majority of crimes committed in bourgeois society are either direct infringements of property rights or indirectly connected with property. It is natural that the bourgeois State should take vengeance upon criminals and that the punishment inflicted by bourgeois society should be various expressions of the vengeful sentiments of the infuriated owner." (A. B. C. of Communism, page 232).

Every crime against the State—sedition, treason or other political crime—is considered by the bourgeois jurists not merely as a crime against the bourgeois State but as a crime against society as a whole. I have already quoted the brilliant remarks of the learned Crown Counsel in this case before the Allahabad High Court, which is an example in point. To the bourgeois jurist the present order of society is a final order. Anything that upsets it, annihilates the very basis of human society. Naturally a society in which the bourgeoisie does not rule is for him out of the question. It simply cannot exist. A society without bourgeois domination is anarchy. This is the point of view of the bourgeois rulers all over the world. The bourgeois machinery of justice hypocritically proclaims itself to be the voice of the people and suppresses the enemies of its State in the name of the welfare of the society at large.

In countries like India where a foreign Imperialist bourgeoisie rules, this hypocritical gesture is too palpable and too shamelessly flagrant. It is abundantly clear even to the bourgeois politicians of foreign countries that all these instruments of legislation—ordinary and extraordinary which are at present in the hands of the British courts in India, are not in the interest of Indian society but were merely to safeguard the British rule, to perpetuate the slavery and exploitation of the Indian masses at the hands of the British Imperialist bourgeoisie.

In conclusion, therefore, I once again reiterate that I do not expect any justice from this Court. Why then this lengthy defence statement, you will ask? My answer is quite simple. The purpose of my defence statement is to tear the mask of the so-called "abstract justice" and show it in its naked and brutal form of "class justice". And I feel confident that I have very largely succeeded in my object.

Q. What about your Defence witnesses ?

A. I shall specify my witnesses later. I do not want to do so now lest they be tampered with.

Sd. S. S. Mirajkar

Sd. R. L. Yorke

Q. You have now read over your statement again and it has been corrected and amended as and where requested by you. Are you now satisfied that the record is correct ?

A. Yes.

Sd. R. L. Yorke

21. 11. 31.

Sd. S. S. Mirajkar

Certified that the above is a full and true account of the statement of the accused taken down by steno-graphers in my presence and hearing, and subsequently transcribed by them and amended and corrected as and where requested by the accused, and admitted by him to be correct.

Sd. R. L. Yorke

21. 11. 31.

In the Court of R. L. Yorke Esqr., I. C. S., Addl. Sessions Judge, Meerut.

In the case of King Emperor versus P. Spratt and others.

Examination of S.V. Ghate accused under section 342 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1898, made before me R. L. Yorke, Addl. Sessions Judge at Meerut on the 14th day of December 1931.

My name is Sachhidanand Vishnu Ghate; my father's name is Vishnu Ghate; I am by caste No Caste; 34 years of age; by occupation Printer and Publisher; my home is at Bombay, Police-station Bombay, District Bombay; I reside at Bombay.

Q. You heard your statement in the Lower Court P 2610 read over to you on 16-3-31. Is that statement correct?

A. Yes.

Q. The following evidence relates to (1) your foreign connections and (2) your connection with the Communist Party of India.

(1) P 2321 P, P 322 (1), 2324 P, 1287 (14), (6), 2326 P, 1828, 1007, 2328 P, I, 2329 P 1, & P, 1009, 1671 P, 1316, 1597, 2032 P, 1536, 1599, 1348 (27), 2056 P, 1348 (34), 1600, 1537, 2186, 2408 P, 1540, 1648, 1348 (20) (29), 1610, 1675 P, 2216 & (1), 2211, 1658 P, 2057 P, 1281.

(2) P 1287, 782, 1207 (1), 1140, 1836 P, 1837 R, 1139, 2321 P, 1287 (16), 780, 1143, 781, 1324 (1207 (1)), 2128 P, 2132 C, P 1375 Kranti of 9-7-27, 989 Kranti of 4-6-27 and 11-6-27, 1911, 1312, 2101 C, 1287 (5) (4), 1285, 1287 (1) and (2) and (3), 2055 C, 2127 P, 549 (20), 1286, 1330, 1295, 1300, 1303, 1305, 1306, 1307, 1309, 1310, 1296, 1297, 1171, 1284 and 1294.

Have you anything to say in explanation of the above evidence?

D/15-12-31.

A. The Prosecution have made wild and fantastic statements with regard to the C.P.I., the Communists and the Communist ideology which they could hardly understand, and wherever they did they have deliberately twisted those facts to suit their own conclusions as did the late Mr. Langford James in his Opening Address. As if in obedience to the voice of the Prosecution, the learned Magistrate outdid the Prosecution, accepted all the fantastic charges and came to hopelessly muddled conclusions which were inevitable. I do not propose to go into the learned nonsense which the Prosecution and Magistrate have displayed in their propagandist address and the Committal Order respectively. Nor do I propose to go into the partisan attitude which the "impartial" Magistrate has betrayed in the Committal Order. But it is necessary for me in the interest of the Party to which I belong and of

which I was the General Secretary till the day of my arrest—I mean the Communist Party of India—to place certain facts before you with regard to Communism and the C. P. I. in particular. Not that I have any illusions about your taking them seriously excepting to use them against me; but before you can arrive at any conclusions I must clear some of the wrong notions that have been broadcast with regard to Communism and the C.P.I.—and explode that monument of falsehood, the Opening Address of the Prosecution.

Why is the Communist an eyesore to the ruling class to-day? Why are they (Communists) painted as a set of hateful persons who should be avoided or shut in prison?—at any rate that is what the Prosecution have been trying to make out. What is there in Communism that frightens them so much? To me it seems that it is because we believe in the irreconcilability of the antagonisms between the classes that comprise the modern society—because we believe in class war; because we believe that the interests of the toiling masses are fundamentally opposed to the interests of those that represent the ruling class; because we believe that their class has long outlived its usefulness and as such has no right to be in the position in which it is to-day; because we believe that the vast majority of the workers and peasants have a right to all the things they produce—because of all these facts this class sees a mighty opponent, its future hang-man in the class that we represent—and hence this monument of frenzied falsehood and an insensate hurry to crush its opponents before it gains that might.

As I have said before, the fantastic charges against us are due to a lack of understanding on the part of the Prosecution of historical forces that are at work. Marx expressed this idea in the most general form. “The mode of production in material life determines the general character of the social, political and spiritual process of life. It is not the consciousness of men that determines their existence, but on the contrary their social existence determines their consciousness. At a certain stage in this development the material forces of production in society come into conflict with the existing relations of production as in the property relations within which they had been at work before. From forms of development of the forces of production, these turn into its fetters—there comes the period of social revolution; with the change of economic foundations the entire superstructure is more or less rapidly transformed.”

These forces do not wait for anybody; no amount of suppressing them is of any avail, though the class that is then in power makes frantic efforts to overcome these forces, and maintain its supremacy.

One can only contemptuously laugh at the Prosecution's stupendous ignorance of these forces, and their attempts at fabrication. Does one wait for instructions from anywhere? The contradictions of capitalist society are enough to create conditions necessary for a Proletarian

Revolution. Capitalist economy suffers from periodic crisis. The results are more or less recurring—commodities remaining unsold—hence production reduced, increase of unemployment and lowering down of wages, thereby intensifying the difference between the level of production and the level of purchasing demand. The crisis of over-production is the expression of this contradiction in an unbridled and destructive form. One has only to look to the European history to-day.

It is stupid to imagine that a handful of men can conspire to overthrow any Government just in order to please themselves. That is at any rate what the Prosecution has tried to make out. Like any other group of people that believe in some form of political philosophy, the Communists interpret history from a materialistic standpoint, which, I believe, is the only correct form of interpretation of history. Communist policy is the only policy which can deal with the world as it is to-day. The evils that the present day capitalist economy is suffering from, can only be cured by Socialism. The Communists only develop the class struggle that exists in the capitalist society to-day.

Here I want to clear some wrong impressions that are spread about Communism and Communists generally. The Communist theory is supposed to be a foreign element that has been introduced into India by the agents of the Bolsheviks; that they have introduced this foreign philosophy in this country with her most ancient Vedic history behind her, with her glorious spiritual culture of the past and so on. These wise men do not care to think for a moment whether or not the world events are affecting India daily. The vast commercial markets, Banks etc., that are the essential features of a modern city—are they in this spiritual past of India? The long wars for the possession of the world's resources with their frightful tale of murders, were they from this spiritual past of India? The immense poverty of the wide masses of India, is this also a memory of past culture? The big cities that have sprung up with the advent of modern trade and commerce bringing in their train child labour, intolerable misery, unemployment, high death rate and so on—are all these a remnant of our spiritual culture of ancient times? Then why should the Communist theory be dubbed as foreign to our civilisation? The whole world is changing, progressing. Old forms have crumbled before the advent of modern progress; old society has perished by the rising force of the new class. The primitive social system gave way before the feudal system, and in the 18th century with the rise of the bourgeois class, feudal society was destroyed because of the development of the forces of production necessitating a more complex social structure. This in its turn resulted in the sharpening of class contradictions. These contradictions, born of the complex system of the present day capitalist economy, become the basis for the destruction of this form of society, thus proving the statement of Marx that each system

of society has within it the germs of its own destruction. Hence as we see it the destruction of this social system is inevitably drawing nearer. This inevitability does not mean that one has to sit with folded hands without developing the class forces, without assisting in the sharpening of the class contradictions. The Communists become the vanguard in the struggle of this class and prepare for the final overthrow of the system that enchains this class. When from the feudal society there emerged the present society, was it a foreign idea that was introduced? What I want to emphasise is that there is nothing foreign in the Communist idea, excepting that it scientifically and honestly looks into the evils that are convulsing the present day society. It has become a fashion to say that problems affecting the welfare of the masses are foreign to our ancient culture, but whatever brings profits to the capitalist class, speculations, colonial wars, these are not foreign. During all this period of history the struggle of the oppressed for their liberation from their exploiters has continued and will continue till the system is completely destroyed. "The history of mankind is the history of class struggle," Marx has said. The majority of the people have been under systematic oppression and have at all times attempted to break the chains that bind them; and the Communists' attempt to lead this oppressed class in their fight for liberation and once for all to put an end to the system of society which makes it possible for the majority of its members to be under a chronic state of oppression.

This naturally should explode the idea that we are the agents of anybody. Because if conditions for the growth of this idea were non-existent no "agents" could have imported them.

I have stated that the destruction of the capitalist system is inevitable because of the fundamental contradictions within itself. It is visibly decaying. The anarchy of production which leads to competition, wars etc., and then its class character cannot last long. The society that we want to build up, after the destruction of the present one, will necessarily be free from the evils of the present day system. It will be a classless society free from the anarchy of production and the evils that follow.

The basis of this society is the ownership of the means of production and distribution—under the control of society as a whole, and not under individual owners for individual benefit. Production will be planfully organised, so that there will be no chaos in production, and hence free from all the evils that follow. There will at the same time be no two classes eternally at war with each other, and also there will be an end to exploitation. Because under the Communist system of society territorial and national boundaries vanish, and with that the exploitation of one people by another.

This system, freeing as it does all society, will release such forces heretofore unknown to mankind. The energy of mankind now wasted in wars will then be directed to a new channel. There will be plentiful production and therefore in an improved form and more economic. Technique will improve because the society expects to get the best out of it. The leisure class will disappear completely when all the members of society will be engaged in productive labour.

All this development would mean that the workers in a Communist society will not have to work as much as before. Man will be more free from the fight for bread and living. He can turn his attention to the development of real and genuine culture.

The next point that I want to lay stress on, is the fraudulent statement made by the Prosecution that we are "anti-national—anti everything in fact". This sudden surge of sentiment in favour of God, the nation, its leaders etc. should create misgiving as to the intentions of the Prosecution. This sudden love for the Congress is essentially misleading, particularly from people who have all along stood for the violent suppression of all national parties. I do not deny that we are anti-imperialist and anti-everything hypocritical in the present social order. Because the whole of bourgeois society is based on merciless exploitation of the masses and does not recognise any national boundaries itself. But yet it never ceases boasting of nationalism, democracy, Government of the people and so on, hoodwinking the masses under cover of patriotic phrases of national glory and greatness and subjecting them to untold miseries. By "national" the bourgeois class means itself and none else, while it pretends that it exists for the benefit of the whole of the society. "National" wars, sacrificing millions of the toiling masses, are conducted for colonial possessions and millions sacrificed and maimed, without any gain for themselves, but just to help the growing greed of this class for power and possession. Only the ex-soldiers who have fought and who now parade the streets in search of employment and bread in the leading cities of capitalist countries, only they can state what patriotism and nationalism has brought them to—increased misery and chronic hunger. They no longer become part of the nation though they still form the reserve for future wars. If it is this form of nationalism that is meant by the charge I am anti this nationalism.

As a Communist I recognise no national limitations. Communists are enemies of all Imperialist Governments alike. The genuine revolutionary movement in India—the Congress cannot claim to be this—(which I shall refer to later) is struggling for the overthrow of British Imperialism in India. As a Communist I am interested, as all Communists are, in this movement for the forcible overthrow of Imperialism and as such I look at this movement for the liberation of Indian masses as an attack on Imperialism, and come to its aid just as America came

to the assistance of the Allies during the onslaught of German Imperialism in 1917. As Communists, we welcome any movement for the liberation of the oppressed masses and are ready to help them in this struggle. We sincerely look with suspicion at the ways and methods of the Congress and it may be nearer truth to say that we are anti-“National” Congress, because we do not believe that the Congress is a genuine revolutionary organisation that is only trying to overthrow the British Imperialism.

Speaking about the Bolsheviks, Prince Mirsky, an exile in England since the Russian Revolution of 1917, writes in his preface to his book “Lenin” as follows: “Before we became internationalists we had come to understand that whatever else they might be, the Communists who had vindicated the independence of the workers’ and peasants’ U.S.S.R. were better patriots than the “National” Russians who had allied themselves with foreign Imperialism in return for help against their “class enemies”. Mark the words ‘class enemies’ meaning the Government of the workers and peasants in Russia.” This is an aristocrat’s opinion after fourteen years of exile. Our internationalism cannot be interpreted to mean that we are anti-national. Who are the anti-nationalists then?

The “National” Government of MacDonald, Baldwin & Co. is no more national than the national Government of Mussolini or Chang-Kai-Shek. The one-time spokesman of the workers and the leader of the Labour Party—MacDonald, for the sake of saving the nation was willing to starve thousands of the unemployed of his nation and was willing to send hundreds of them into their graves more speedily by using forces in London and this too with a view to save the “national calamity.” The only difference which is apparent is that in a colonial country the use of machine guns and tanks is a more frequent occurrence than the use of police batons. Not that the MacDonald Government would have hesitated to shoot down the “rowdy” demonstrators any more than the nationally inclined Indian capitalists, the Birlas and the Tatas and their class, hesitate to take the assistance of British police and troops to shoot down Indian workers going on strike to resist the reduction of wages. While at the same time professing to stand by the National Congress, they do not hesitate to make alliance with Imperialism as against the Indian masses.

I claim therefore that we are not anti-national, as we have been represented to be by the Prosecution. We are internationalists. We do not recognise any national boundaries. We say that the capitalists themselves are anti-national, while being international exploiters having no scruples about enslaving and exploiting any nation or any country.

I now come to the next point that I want to deal with and that is in regard to the National Congress which is apparently fighting for the liberation of the masses by getting them to dress in khaddar, by getting

them to spin and so on. The professions of Gandhi that he is doing his best for the masses by himself going in loim cloth, has been exploded sufficiently. I want to add that the only thing that the masses have got ever since the damned Gandhi-Irwin Agreement has been the shower of bullets, that the rising tide of the agrarian masses got when they rose in revolt against the intolerable repressive conditions of their zamindars and land-owners and the merciless police batons they got from the agents of Irwin, the signatory on behalf of the Imperial Government. In consequence of the Congress professing to liberate the masses through a non-violent revolution questions arise of how far the Congress has been, if ever, revolutionary, and if so, how far it was genuine? These questions have arisen particularly since the Lahore Resolution on Independence which was subsequently modified at Karachi to suit the changed tastes of the "revolutionary" Congress—the Congress that wanted to liberate the masses from foreign domination. The Independence Resolution itself was passed at Lahore just because the pressure of the youths on the opportunist Congress leaders was great, and as such they had to yield to this pressure. But the glamour of the Round Table Conference, preceded by conferences between the Birlas and Modys at the Congress headquarters just after the ignominious defeat culminating in the signing of the Pact, was too tempting to these Congress leaders and without a moment's thought they threw overboard the Independence Resolution and adopted the Dominion Status Resolution instead.

The Congress leaders found that the forces they had released in the Civil Disobedience Movement, which started with a theft of a handful of salt by the Mahatma, was also born another mighty force in the form of genuine agrarian discontent which rose to threatening heights. This was too much for the people who had not thought beyond stealing salt and picketing foreign cloth shops. Their non-violent revolution culminated in the, now dead, Gandhi-Irwin Pact at Delhi. The real revolutionary elements when they rose in revolt against the oppressive conditions like in Sholapur, Peshawar, Allahabad etc.—these elements were sacrificed by the Mahatma to his fetish of non-violence; and the Government almost with the tacit consent of the "mighty Congress" that fought the "mighty British Empire", shot down the peasants in Allahabad, the Punjab and Madras etc.

That king amongst tricksters, the great opportunist and ex-President of the Indian Legislative Assembly, thundering mighty words of empty threat from Vienna and Paris, has a good word to say of the Mahatma. At Mahatma's birthday celebrations in London Mr. V. J. Patel, said, "I warn Britain that it is Gandhiji who to-day has been keeping revolution from sweeping over India. There is not the slightest doubt that India is drifting towards revolution and India is Mahatmaji." I agree. It is Mahatma, the one and the only representative of the mighty national Congress, that is impeding the advance of

the Indian revolution—who is to-day acting as the policeman of the British Empire in India—who is being feted at the seat of the mighty British Empire—who is talking things he never means—who is flattering the mill-owners of Lancashire now that he is amidst them—who is very grateful to the admirable Mr. MacDonald for the wonderful way in which he conducted the proceedings of the Round Table Conference without letting any one know what the real intentions of the British Government were—it is this Mahatma who is standing between revolution and India

D/16-12-31.

There was no protest from the Mahatma when after winding up the Conference Mr. MacDonald audaciously told the Parliament that India did not want Independence. The Congress and its spokesmen are very vague and uncertain about what actually they want—at one time it is independence, at another it is Dominion Status and so on. How can there be a compromise between a nation struggling against Imperialist domination and an Imperialist Government? Mahatmic jugglery alone can explain this.

How can the toiling masses of India have faith in an organisation that does not belong to their class, that is only the mouthpiece of Indian capitalists? How can the masses trust an organisation that makes peace with the enemy in spite of 12 Ordinances to its credit? In spite of the fact that the Government officials have always refused to negotiate, the Congress has been always desirous for a compromise. The masses cannot continue to believe in the professions of the Congress, while the visible effect of its policy has been disastrous for them.

The fact is that the Congress is a bourgeois organisation which has found in Mahatma Gandhi a convenient mouthpiece for its own half-hearted sham fight for independence from British Imperialism. But the misfortune of this class is that Imperialism will never relinquish its hold until it is forced to do so—until it is violently overthrown. The bourgeois class is apparently hostile and is fighting Imperialism. But this hostility is not genuinely inspired for its overthrow. It is only a hostility to get an equal partnership in the exploitation of the masses of our country; because the best portion of the profits from exploitation of the masses of this country go over to the Imperialist rulers, because Imperialism controls the keys of exploitation and sacrifices the interest of the Indian bourgeoisie in its own interest—as was evinced in the recent dictum of the Secretary of State in regard to the currency policy in India, over which so much hue and cry has been raised by the Indian bourgeoisie. The bourgeoisie by itself will not be able to fight Imperialism for other reasons besides; because of the close association of British and Indian capital in industries with the dominance of the former.

That is why the Congress, which is an organisation that represents the bourgeoisie, cannot fulfil its promises to the wide masses of the industrial workers and peasants. That is why it has to seek outlets for its own hypocritical promises by trying to make every effort at negotiations with Imperialism. The spokesman of the Congress at the R.T.C. has, in his triumphal tour in Britain, expressly stated that he would not insist on independence for India, if he can secure an honourable partnership in the British Commonwealth and that he would be exploring every possible avenue towards this end. "I am here to compromise and consider every formula that British or Indian ingenuity can prepare" (Gandhi at the R. T. C.). This statement at the R. T. C. is in contradiction to the statements that he made while in India. Only a quixotic Mahatmian brain is capable of a jugglery of this kind. But suffice it to say that the Congress, the organisation of the bourgeoisie, can never be sincere in its fight with Imperialism,—the Congress that is flirting with the MacDonald Government. The hypocritical Labour Party did not hesitate to throw overboard Parliamentary Democracy and to carry on the Government without any sanction behind them, and to-day this stalwart saviour of the British nation—Mr. MacDonald—is in the midst of the Tory majority, and is working at the dictation of Baldwin and Company having sold his Labour ticket for glamour of power and name. What his newly found rich friends will do to him is not difficult to foresee.

The policy of Gandhism, on which the programme of the Congress is based, uses the cloak of vague phrases of love, meekness, hard-working existence, lightening the burden of the peasantry, national unity etc. Under this cloak Gandhism only defends the interest of the Indian capitalists, the inevitability of the division of society into rich and poor, eternal social inequality and exploitation. In fact it preaches the interests of the capitalist development of India on the sweat of the working masses in alliance with world Imperialism. We know that the National Congress had betrayed the struggle of the Indian toilers in 1921. During the strikes in various parts of the country it had supported the manufacturers as against the strikers. The National Congress had refused to support the fight of the railwaymen against British Imperialism; the National Congress had refused to support the peasantry in their struggle against moneylenders, the big landlords and the feudal princes. The National Congress, and particularly its "Left Wing" have done and are still doing all in their power to restrain the struggle of the masses within the framework of the British Imperialistic constitution and legislation.

Which brings me directly to the question of a party of the working class in India. Just as the bourgeoisie have their own parties like the Liberal Party, the Republican Party, the Independence Party and so on to represent their interests, the working class accordingly as it gathers strength forms its own party to fight for emancipation from

Imperialist exploitation. In this connection, world history and the lessons of the class struggle in India prove that only the leadership of the working class can ensure the fulfilment of the historic tasks of emancipating the wide strata of the Indian people, abolishing national slavery, smashing all the fetters that check the national development, confiscating the land and effecting far-reaching democratic reconstruction of a revolutionary character. The working class organised by the industrial process itself and by class struggle, will, under the leadership of the C.P. as its vanguard, organise the scattered masses of peasantry for struggle against British domination and landlordism.

Just as the other capitalist interests have their own parties, the working class needs its own Party—the Communist Party—in order to organise the masses of the workers, in order to rally the proletariat into a distinct class force, conscious of its class interest, fighting for the leadership of the National Movement for emancipation, in order to bring about an alliance of the working class and the peasantry, in order to liberate the working class and the peasantry from the hands of national reformism and direct their revolutionary struggle towards an anti-Imperialist and anti-feudal revolution—for all these purposes the working class requires its own party.

Why do we lay emphasis on the working class as the leader of the toiling masses struggling for freedom from the Imperialist and capitalist yoke?

The working class is concentrated in big cities and most of it is drafted from the impoverished peasantry, so that it becomes a homogeneous class by itself. The very conditions of production compel it to unite in a way which is not possible for the peasantry or any other class. The working class thereby gains class consciousness and understands the nature of the political and economic system that sucks its life blood. In fact there is very little clash of interest between different sections of the working class as there is between the peasantry. On the contrary the peasantry is tied down to the land and by the very mode of production its progress is very slow, and even if it may fight against the oppression by zamindars and moneylenders it can hardly unite against its oppressors because of its being scattered all over the country. Hence it becomes impossible for it to fight against its oppressors as a united class. Therefore the working class imbued with a more thorough revolutionary outlook and being placed in a position to control strategic points—the big towns, the decisive parts of the productive system and transport, of society, in alliance with the peasantry inevitably takes the lead. Numerically the Indian working class is very weak; but the working class in China which played a definite part in the revolution was smaller in number than the working class in India. At the time of the Russian Revolution the Russian working class was only a small fraction of its peasantry. Hence the numerical weakness

of the Indian working class is not so formidable as it may appear. It therefore can and will be the leading class in the Indian revolution. While the peasantry will seize the land and overthrow the feudal capitalist system of exploitation, the Indian working class will direct its offensive against the State power of the ruling class itself. The working class and its party will be the deciding factor and the directing force.

An honest genuine revolutionary working class party is therefore necessary, and that is the Communist Party of India, which alone can truly represent the interests of the toiling masses. The C.P.I. is the party of the working class, the aim of which is the achievement of Socialism and ultimately of complete Communism. Being a Party of the revolutionary working class, its programme is entirely different in principle from that of other parties and groups which are parties of the capitalists and the petty bourgeoisie, not excepting the nationalist revolutionary parties. While the other parties are struggling for the development of capitalism in India the C. P. fights for the Socialist part of development; while the national revolutionary groups are fighting for bourgeois rule and a bourgeois form of Government, the C. P. is fighting for Democratic Dictatorship of the working class and the peasantry—the Workers' and Peasants' Soviet Government in India.

The role of the C. P.

The C. P. is an organisation of the most active and conscious elements of the working-class. It is organised for the purpose of actively leading the working-class in its struggle against its class enemy—the capitalist class. This involves the overthrow of the capitalist class which at present dominates over the mass of workers.

The period of reformist compromises comes to an end with the development of the capitalist class itself. It becomes impossible for the workers to fight constitutionally in a labour reformist manner—through compromise and conciliation. During the last phase of Capitalism—Imperialism—when the exploiting class is unable to come to any compromise with the working class, because it is itself in a decaying state; hence during this decline the struggle will have to be fought on a revolutionary basis, which condition demands the formation of a new party, a new fighting force—that is the Communist Party.

In this connection it will not be out of place to refer to the complete collapse of the Labour Party in Britain—the Party of Mr. MacDonald, who did not hesitate to join the Tories as against his own Party. If anything the recent election results prove that the period of reformism—high flown phrases and promises that are never carried into action—is over. Mr. MacDonald finds himself in the midst of a Conservative group without any sanction behind himself excepting the nominal satisfaction of being the head of the Government, liable to

be thrown out if he refuses to be the puppet of the capitalist class represented by Baldwin & Co. The reformist defeat of the phrasemongers like Henderson at the elections is the proof of the fact that the situation is becoming more and more clarified, and that Fascism under the garb of corrupt parliamentary democracy is ruling with an iron hand. And the workers betrayed by the erstwhile Labour leaders are coming to understand that there is only one method and that is of revolutionary overthrow of the present order and that can be done only under the leadership of the C. P.

The world Communist Party, that is the Communist International, is perhaps the most organised force of the working class and the oppressed peoples. The C. P. represents the workers not as belonging to one particular craft or industry, not as miners, railwaymen etc., but as members of one class, whose conditions of economic subjection are the same and whose political interests are identical. The Party brings all the revolutionary elements into a common organisation, concentrating and co-ordinating their forces for the task of leading the masses for freedom, which is realised through the Party. The Party is also the highest form of class organisation of the workers, as a rallying point for the best elements of the working-class. It is the best school for the training of leaders for organising the working-class struggle.

A trained and well disciplined party is necessary not only to lead the masses to the capture of power but also to maintain its victory. It is essential to note here that it is a party of action, and that it is not a sect or a propagandist body. Self-imposed discipline and a class co-ordination of the forces of the party are necessary for the successful carrying out of the struggle against the capitalist class. The Party by its clear revolutionary policy is able to see further than the masses, will guide them and actively participate in their daily struggles. The Party has no interest excepting those of the working-class. It is the dynamic force which organises the workers by participating in their daily struggle, and leads them to the final seizure of power. "The Party is no true party if it limits its activities to a mere registration of the sufferings of the proletarian masses; if it is content to be dragged along in the wake of the spontaneous movement of the masses; if it cannot overcome the political indifference of the masses; if it is incapable of inspiring the masses with a proletarian class consciousness." (Stalin). The Party is to be at the head of the working-class fight. It becomes the vanguard of the struggle—it comprises the war staff of the proletarian army. The Party is inalienably born of the working-class.

The attitude of the C.P. to the State.

The Prosecution have made much of the question of "smashing of the existing State machinery" and have quoted from the thesis of the Fifth World Congress and also from Lenin. We have no quarrel about this. They have only stated the correct thing. Communists want to

smash the existing State machinery and build a new one in its place during the transition to Communism. Because the present State is only best suited to the interests of the governing class, because "the State is the organ of class domination, the organ of oppression of one class by another. Its aim is the creation of order which perpetuates this oppression". The State in short is the product and expression of the irreconcilability of class antagonisms. It is therefore best suited to the needs of its own class. The bourgeois State therefore will be of no use for the working-class when it has captured power. The working-class will have to create its own State in order to maintain the revolution against the other class, which will try all in its power to crush the revolution. The assistance that the British, the French and the American Governments gave to the counter revolutionary wars in Soviet Russia after the 1917 Revolution, can testify to this revolutionary need. This State will depend on the will of the majority of the workers and peasants, not in the interest of small minorities, and will exist on the support of the wide masses.

The State machinery in India exists in the interest of the British bourgeoisie and as such is suited only to serve their interest. The Indian masses can have no use from such a machinery at all. The establishment of a new State suited to, and standing for the wide masses of the workers and peasants will essentially mean the smashing up of the present State, and the party of the working-class can accomplish this. Lenin said that "the proletarian revolution cannot take place without the forcible destruction of the bourgeois State machinery and its replacement by a new machine". The withering away of the State will be a later process when a new society emerges as a result of the new proletarian culture, when the need for a State ceases to exist.

The C. P. I.

It has been suggested by the Prosecution that the workers' and peasants' parties in different parts of the country, which finally formed themselves into an all-India organisation in December 1928, were really a cloak for the Communist Party of India. Nothing can be more absurd than this. The Committing Magistrate could not come to any different conclusion from that indicated by the Prosecution.

The C. P. I. came into existence openly in 1925 after the first Communist Conference, and though under the watchful eyes of the all pervading Government agents, was not declared illegal, and as far as I know has not been declared illegal to this day.

Here I must make one point clear. The Communist Party is the political party of the working-class, just as any other party, the Congress Party, the Swaraj Party etc., but only more sincere, with a more scientific programme for the wide exploited masses of the country, and as such it has a right to exist as any other political organisation. Not

that it will die away at the stroke of a signature from the Viceroy. It will not be afraid to go underground and lead the working-class to the capture of State power. The Party will certainly work openly as long as it is possible for it to do so. Not that we attach any importance to its legal existence.

I know it is very difficult for a party of the working-class which fights for the emancipation of the exploited masses of Indian workers and peasants to exist legally in any country, let alone India. Communist Parties have existed and are still existing legally in most of the capitalist countries—England, France, Germany, South Africa, etc. Because the programme of the Communist Party sounds the death knell of the ruling class, it will never cease to be a constant danger to British Imperialism, and as such if the Party was allowed the latitude it has by the Government, there must have been a sinister motive behind this "gracefulness" of the British rulers.

Whatever that may be, the C. P. I. was an open political organisation. It came into being at the first Communist Conference held at Cawnpore in 1925. Parties do not come into existence merely for the fun of it. Certain conditions help their growth. Here in this case the conditions of the toiling masses in India under the yoke of British imperialism have been most oppressive. With its political and economic hold on India, blood-thirsty Imperialism has thrown the toiling masses into the throes of famine, poverty and a state of utter misery—by squeezing their life blood. These conditions precipitated the emergence of the C. P. I. Added to this was the systematic oppression, and suppression of all expression of opinion that was carried on by the rulers in the merciless suppression of the agrarian revolt at Chauri Chaura etc. In 1921 Government had sentenced twelve men who returned from Russia and thereby had shown its impatience at the flow of socialist idea into the country, which culminated in what is known as the Cawnpore Conspiracy Case.

The work of the Party spreads over a period of years and the work that it could do was limited by the very conditions under which it was born.

When the Party was formed in 1925 I was elected one of its general secretaries. The Party issued a manifesto on the Hindu-Muslim question in 1926 during the Hindu-Muslim riots at Calcutta. A manifesto addressed to the Gauhati Congress was broadcast. The manifesto was printed in England. A Conference of the Party was held in 1927. Meetings were held under the auspices of the C. P. I. at Madras and Bombay. A reception was organised for Saklatwala and also for Usmani when he was released from prison after undergoing his full term of imprisonment.

D/17-12-31.

Lenin Day was organised in January 1928. Then comes the Roy letter made much of by the Prosecution. The Party issued a statement on this letter challenging the existence of such a letter. In fact with the vast resources that the Government has, it is not difficult for them to forge any signature and in this particular instance it was doing so to frighten away the "people's representatives" in the Assembly, and thereby to gain the support of this class in suppressing the rising movement for the liberation of the masses. All the attempts of the Prosecution at proving the genuineness of such a document have not been convincing excepting perhaps to themselves.

In connection with this letter I have to state that if the Party called this letter a forgery there were good reasons for it. The nefarious tactics of the Conservative Party in England, which plotted the downfall of the first Labour Government in 1924 by the now notorious Zinovieff letter forgery, were too fresh to be forgotten. We have known that the Government would not hesitate to stoop down to any length to gain its ends. Already open propaganda was being done against Communists and Communism by the most responsible members of the Government and the capitalist class, apart from their underhand propaganda through a subsidised press. Besides it is difficult to imagine why the Government sat over this letter which they received in December 1927, till the end of 1928 before giving it publicity. The reasons are obvious. The year 1928 saw a rising tide of strikes all over the country and in order to frighten the bourgeoisie and win them over completely to their side, this letter was given wide publicity and was discussed in the Assembly. The Party took the only course it could at that time, of denouncing it as a forgery.

My idea in stating all these facts is only to show how malicious the argument of the Prosecution is, when it called the W.P.P. as a veiled Communist Party. What need was there for working under cover when we could exist openly as a Communist Party—when the Party had a lot of work to its credit during the first three years? The Workers' and Peasants' Party had a separate programme regarding its own policy and tactics, and the C. P. I. had no need to hide itself behind this camouflage.

Before going into the aims and programme of the C. P. I. I want to state that the C. P. I. was not, at the time of our arrest, affiliated to the Communist International. But this, according to the Prosecution is not necessary at all in this case. According to them they are under no obligation to prove anything. Here is what Mr. Langford James says in his Opening Address: "It is not in the least bit necessary to prove that any one of the accused was the member of such a Party." He refers to the Communist Party of India. I am tempted to agree with him. Proof is the least necessary in this case. The Prosecution seems

to be under no obligation to prove anything, as I said, excepting securing our incarceration. Not that we would have hesitated to affiliate the C. P. I. to the C. I. I think we were actually wanting to affiliate the Party to the C. I.; because the C. I. is a fighting organisation for directing the International movement of the working class and oppressed peoples. Since its existence it has always brought forward the programme of the world revolution and has assisted the working-class movement. It has been the only organisation that has so far espoused the cause of the oppressed peoples all the world over. It is in fact the world party of the working-class, affiliated to which are the Communist Parties from different countries. So if the C. P. I. desired affiliation with this world organisation—to which the Communist Parties of most of the Imperialist countries are openly affiliated—I do not see any reason why His Majesty's sovereignty should tremble at the mere idea of this Party forming a part of the world revolutionary organisation. I have in mind the Communist Party of Great Britain with its headquarters in London, the Imperialist capital which does not frighten away His Majesty's sovereignty in spite of its close proximity. So also there are other countries the C. Ps. of which are affiliated to the C. I. without directly coming under the ban of Imperialist laws. This only goes to prove that Imperialism cannot tolerate any of these movements for the liberation of the masses in the colonies and other dependencies. The Prosecution have not attempted to hide this fact. Mr. Kemp, arguing against the bail applications of some of us at Allahabad a few months ago, while admitting that the accused had done no overt or illegal act, stated that letting the Communists on bail would have meant a victory to the Comintern. According to him a Communist may never remain free because he becomes a chronic danger to the State.

I say this, that it is the right of every Communist Party to affiliate itself to a centralised world organisation—and the C. I. comprising as it does all the Communist Parties of the world becomes the leader of all these parties. We should certainly have affiliated our Party if we had an opportunity to do so.

There is nothing to be surprised at in this. We make no pretence about the fact that only complete abolition of British rule, bringing in its train the liberation of the country and the abolition of feudalism and serfdom throughout the Indian social order, will create conditions for improving the life of the masses in this country. The C. I. is an organisation that stands for and assists in the fight of the oppressed peoples.

The C. P. I. at the time of its inception had no doubt some very doubtful elements like Satya Bhakta and Begerhotta. The former was frightened even from the beginning, when he found that the organisation which he thought would be useful to himself was growing out of all proportions. The more doubtful element Begerhotta (we suspect that

he even played the part of an occasional informer) continued nominally for about a year, when finally he was compelled to leave the Party because of his doubtful associations and intentions.

The Party accepted the tasks laid down by the Comintern though it was not formally affiliated to it.

The tasks of the C. P. I.

"The basic tasks of the Indian Communists consist in a struggle against British Imperialism for the emancipation of the country, for the destruction of all the relics of féudalism, for the agrarian revolution and the establishment of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat and the peasantry in the form of a Soviet Republic." (The Sixth World Congress Theses). In order to destroy the slavery of the Indian people and emancipate the working-class and the peasantry from the poverty which is crushing them down, it is essential to win the independence of the country, and to raise the banner of agrarian revolution, which would smash the system of landlordism surviving from the middle ages, and would cleanse the whole of the country from mediævalism. The agrarian revolution against British capitalism and landlordism must be the basis of the revolutionary emancipation of India. But the capitalist class, united as it is with this system of landlordism and usury, has betrayed the struggle for national independence long ago. The spasmodic attempts at defiance of laws which has been evidenced, was in spite of the capitalist class and their henchmen in the Congress. The greatest obstacle to the victory of the revolution, is the fact that our masses have still some illusions left, with regard to the aims of the National Congress and its professions.

Following as it does the tasks laid down by the C. I. the Communist Party of India puts forward certain demands in accordance with the aims of the Party:—

(1) The complete independence of India by the violent overthrow of British rule, the cancellation of all debts, the confiscation and nationalisation of all factories, banks, railways, sea and river transport and plantation.

(2) Establishment of a Soviet Government. The realisation of the right of national minorities to self-determination including separation. Abolition of the Native States. The creation of an Indian Federal Workers Republic.

(3) The confiscation without compensation of all lands belonging to the landlords, ruling princes, etc. and handing over the same for the use of the toiling peasantry. Cancellation of all slave agreements and all the indebtedness of the peasantry to moneylenders.

(4) The eight hour working day and the radical improvement of conditions of Labour, increase in wages and State maintenance of the unemployed.

The C. P. I. fights for these main demands, which express the interest of the mass of the people, and the achievement of which will create the conditions for the building of a Socialist society in India. At the same time the C. P. I. puts forward certain partial demands to facilitate in the mobilisation of the masses for revolutionary insurrection for emancipation. With these objects the Party puts forward certain immediate tasks based on the correct reading of the political situation in the country.

The propaganda of non-violence of Gandhi and others of the National Congress is only intended to prevent the armed insurrection of the toiling masses against British rule. The masses have to-day come to know that the Congress never meant what it stated; that the independence that the Congress wanted was no independence at all but only a partnership in the exploitation of the toiling masses in this country; that the threats which the Congress has been hurling at the mighty Empire were never intended to be carried out; that the war that the Congress has been trumpeting about was only a sham fight;—all these, the toiling masses of workers and peasants have realised to-day. They have been disillusioned about the Congress. The zamindars, some of the supporters of the Congress, are committing unmentionable atrocities on the peasantry with the assistance of the British Police and Military. The patriotic factory owners, under the protection of the Congress, do not hesitate to "inform the Police of the possibility of serious riots breaking out in the event of strike of the workers", fighting against reduction of wages, and actually enlist the help of the police to charge the strikers, wounding several of the workers. The workers and peasants under these conditions will rise and revolt against this feudal and Imperialist exploitation and will bring about a violent overthrow of British rule.

More than the Congress itself there are other dangerous elements like the "Leftists" in the Congress—"Bolsheviks" like Jawahar Lal Nehru—revolutionaries like Bose and Ginwalla. They only help to disorganise and degenerate the revolutionary struggle with revolutionary phraseology while carrying on a bourgeois policy helping the Congress to come to an understanding with Imperialism. In this respect the part played by the reformists, who talk of class collaboration instead of class struggle, is most dangerous. The whole attitude of the Congress has demolished the theory of capturing the Congress and exposing it from within, and the belief that the Congress stood for the masses has also disappeared. The first task of the Party under these conditions would be the merciless exposure of the left national reformists in order to mobilise the workers and the mass of peasantry under the C.P.I. and the anti-Imperialist agrarian revolution in India. With this ideal the C.P.I. organises a united front against the Imperialists, landlords, the money-lenders and capitalists, and the reactionary exploiters. The C.P.I.

organises the workers of different religions and classes warning them not to be tricked by the provoking tactics of those exploiters into fighting with each other. In this it is necessary for the C.P.I. to utilise all methods of legal and illegal work towards the mobilisation of the masses. On every occasion it exposes the treacherous part played by the Congress. Against this bourgeois front of compromise established by the national reformists, the C.P.I. creates a united front of the toilers from below on the basis of definite proletarian revolutionary demands and activities. As the best method of exposing the treacherous policy of the Congress the C.P. must utilise the Trade Unions, Municipal Councils and similar institutions. In this direction the C.P.I. would, with the assistance of its supporters and other organisations, develop the mass revolutionary activities and the struggle of the working class for their political and economic demands, mass refusal by the peasants to pay taxes, debts, rents etc.; thereby mobilising all these forces in the struggle against Imperialism. The C.P.I. brings about a transformation of the individual strikes of the workers into a general political strike as the first step in the fight of the masses for independence, land and workers' and peasants' Government under the guidance of the working class.

The C.P.I. and terrorist activities.

The emancipation of India cannot be achieved by a terrorist movement. The supporters of the terrorist movement of our country do not see and do not believe in the struggle of the broad masses of the people, and do not understand the connection between the agrarian revolution, the struggle of the working class and the overthrow of British domination. They try by single-handed and brave terrorist acts to achieve victory over British Imperialism. While recognising the devotion and self-sacrifice of the terrorists in the cause of the national emancipation of India, the C.P.I. consider that the road to victory is not the method of individual terrorism but the struggle and the revolutionary armed insurrection of the widest masses of the Indian working class and peasantry, and the Indian soldiers under its own leadership.

The C. P. I. as the Party of the proletariat and the leader of the Indian revolution and as the organiser of the masses of this country can alone ensure the victory of the Indian revolution. The building of a mass Party, well disciplined and centralised, is necessary for the revolutionary march. The C. P. I. co-ordinates the work of all the advanced workers and revolutionaries devoted to the cause of the working class into its ranks, in order to fight and carry on the historic tasks of the Indian revolution. In the conditions of British supremacy and terrorism the C. P. I. can exist only as an illegal and underground party applying and utilising all forms of legal and illegal activities—to develop its mass struggle and to win the toiling masses for the fight for a democratic dictatorship of the working class

and the peasantry. The C. P. I. with this idea can set up a party organisation and groups in all towns, factories, workshops etc., throughout the country. The C. P. I. organises the working class and the basic mass of the Indian peasantry under the banner of Indian revolution. In spite of difficulties, sacrifices and partial defeats, in spite of all the efforts of the Imperialist and the Indian bourgeoisie to separate the revolutionary movement of India from the international proletariat, the C. P. I. will lead the struggle for the complete overthrow of British rule and the feudal system, in order to march forward towards the struggle for the establishment of a socialist system throughout the world.

The other demands of the C. P. I. will fall under different headings:—

Workers' Demands.

(1) Eight hour day for adults and youths and the introduction of six hour working day in all dangerous industries ;

(2) Complete freedom of Trade Unions, demonstrations, picketing etc.;

(3) Equal pay for equal work ;

(4) The complete abolition of compulsory labour and system of legal bondage for the workers ;

(5) Compulsory weekly rest period at full pay and an annual paid holiday of four weeks for adults and six weeks for youths ;

(6) State insurance against unemployment, sickness, old age, etc. ;

(7) Introduction of properly organised factory inspections with workers elected as members ;

(8) The abolition of jobbers—the intermediaries in the hiring of labour ;

(9) The abolition of caste and feudal customs and regulations.

The C. P. I. is definitely against the principle of arbitration and interference by capitalist arbitration boards; the sole means of gaining any serious concessions is by resolute class struggle, by strikes and mass revolutionary activities.

The Peasants' Demands.

(1) The confiscation without compensation of all lands and estates belonging to the feudal states, landlords, moneylenders and the Government, and the transference of the same to the Peasant Committees for use by the toiling masses of the peasantry.

(2) The immediate abolition of plantation slavery and the transference of the plantations to the revolutionary committees of plantation workers.

(3) The immediate nationalisation of the whole system of irrigation; cancellation of all indebtedness and taxes and the transference of the control to Peasant Committees elected by the working peasantry.

(4) The refusal to pay rent and other exactions, debts, arrears etc. to the Government, landlords and moneylenders.

All this is necessary because the permanent achievement of these political and social changes is only possible by the overthrow of British domination and the creation of Workers' and Peasants' Republic.

The Soldiers' Demands.

The soldiers and the police are recruited from the poorer peasantry, forced to seek employment because of poverty. The overthrow of British supremacy alone can secure for these soldiers equal allotment of land with the other peasantry. During wars the millions are called into the army, numberless of whom went all hungry to the mouth of the cannon leaving their homes. A goodly number returned after "vanquishing the enemy" and were disbanded and thrown into the streets to seek employment. The patriotism, the courage of these soldiers, many of whom have remained maimed for life, is being rewarded with unemployment, misery and hunger. The services of these soldiers are forgotten immediately after the war and only these soldiers can now tell us of the horrible conditions under which they are living. Their demand therefore will be equal allotment of land with the other peasantry to ensure a comfortable living. It is for these people that the C. P. I. fights.

Youths' Demands.

The organisation of the revolutionary youths to help in spreading political and economic propaganda is another part of the Party's work. The toiling youths have got to be protected against physical and cultural degeneration. Their demands would therefore be:

(1) Limitation of the working day to six hours for youths between 16 and 20, prohibition of employment of children under sixteen.

(2) Universal free compulsory education up to sixteen, free feeding and clothing, the introduction of vocational training at the expense of the State and employers.

(3) Paid weekly and annual holidays.

(4) State maintenance of unemployed youths at rates equivalent to the cost of living.

The C.P.I. will rally under its revolutionary banner all ^{the} toiling masses of the country and carry on the struggle to the conquest of power and the establishment of the democratic dictatorship of workers and peasants in the form of Soviets.

In their struggle for emancipation the Indian masses will have the assistance of the international proletariat, because the workers of all countries are fighting for the overthrow of Imperialism the world over and for the abolition of the whole system of capitalist exploitation which is passing through a great crisis. The crisis of the feudal and capitalist system of exploitation in our country, combined with the world crisis is leading to sharp antagonisms, wars and a new wave of revolutionary struggle. This growing crisis is producing stubborn resistance and a counter-offensive on the part of the international proletariat and the colonial peoples. The strength of the international revolution is growing. The Indian workers in their struggle for emancipation will have the support of the Communist Party of Great Britain and other similar parties. The first workers' and peasants' republic—Soviet Russia—will always be sympathetic to the fighting aspirations of all the oppressed peoples. The Soviet Union alone can be a reliable ally of the masses fighting for liberation in the colonies. In spite of all the devices of Imperialists and their reformist agents the revolutionary front of the world proletariat and colonial peoples is growing stronger every day.

D/18-12-31.

I understand that the Communist Party of India in a recent draft Platform of Action issued by it has put forward certain demands with which, of course, I am in complete agreement.

Foreign Correspondence.

In connection with this, the Prosecution have produced some letters from the League against Imperialism, from C. P. Dutt, from R. I. L. U. and other similar organisations. Anyone can see that there is nothing in these letters that should frighten anyone. The Secretary of the League against Imperialism wrote to me asking for information with regard to the Workers' and Peasants' Party and asked me to place his letter before the Executive Committee of the Workers' and Peasants' Party of Bombay

I think the E. C. of the W. P. P. of Bombay decided to postpone the question of affiliation to the League. At any rate I am not very definite on this point—whether we had actually decided on affiliation to the League.

League against Imperialism.

Here again the argument is brought forward that the League is in reality a Communist organisation, "that it is a body which is definitely

Communist and is doing the work of the Third International under the camouflage of being a wider body"—and all this sort of rubbish which we have been condemned to hear during the last three years. Any fighting organisation is supposed to be under the direction of the C. I., whether it has any actual connection with the C. I. or not. Even Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel was called a "Bolshevik", a "revolutionary" during the Bardoli Satyagraha in 1928, while he himself was anxious to explain that he was not a Communist, not a revolutionary and that he did not believe in class war and that he believed in compromise only. Unfortunately for the Prosecution "this peculiarly non-Communist body" is not a Communist organisation. It is of course a revolutionary body. The League stands for the colonial revolution against Imperialism and assists the masses in the colonial countries in their fight against Imperialist oppressors as its name signifies. The League against Imperialism is a genuine anti-Imperialist revolutionary organisation standing definitely and openly for the complete independence of the colonies. As such it co-ordinates and unites all the anti-Imperialist organisations all over the world. If Communists openly join the League it is ridiculous to imagine that it becomes a subordinate organisation to and controlled by the C.I. It would be as good as to say that the Indian National Congress was a Communist body working under instructions from the Communist International, because some of us Communists were members of the All-India Congress Committee, and most of us in Bombay held important official positions in the Provincial Congress Committee. But it has become a habit with Imperialists to find the hand of the C. I. in any anti-Imperialist revolutionary organisation. The W. P. P. of Bombay stood for the complete independence of India from the Imperialist domination, and if it decided to affiliate itself to the League which also had similar aims I should think that the W. P. P. did the right thing.

The R. I. L. U.

This is another offending organisation in the list of the Prosecution. It is not surprising, because the R. I. L. U. has laid down as its aim the right "class" line, and as such it has been attempting to bring under its Wing all militant Trade Union organisations of the world. It is directing the world Trade Union Movement on the correct line of militant class struggle as against the owners, the exploiting capitalists and as against the Reformist Trade Unions—the aim of this organisation being the overthrow of the capitalist order. Its tactics have been to win over the masses in factories and workshops from the hands of the Reformist Trade Union bosses. The slogan of the R. I. L. U. is for a united front of the rank and file to be built up directly in factories and mills and in the branches of Reformist Trade Unions, to liberate these Trade Unions from the hands of the vacillating reformist bourgeois Labour leaders, who are playing to the tune of the Second International. Amongst some of the Stars from the Second International

are Messrs. MacDonald and Henderson and nearer home we have Messrs. Joshi, Ruikar and Jamnadas Mehta. All these years they have stood for a policy of compromise, conciliation and arbitration which have only resulted in worsening the conditions of Labour. Successful onslaughts on the standard of living of the workers in India have been made possible by the support that the capitalists got from the Reformist Trade Unions. The loose co-operation of the Reformists and employers has resulted in the growing distrust on the part of the mass of workers against these leaders, and they are turning to more militant organisations. The workers are learning from the betrayal of the railway strike by these Reformist leaders, who sacrificed the interest and the fighting demands of the workers for the establishment of an Arbitration Board. They got this after assisting in the breaking of the strike by their hesitating policy. (Contradictory instructions with regard to the continuance of the G. I. P. Rly. strike). Even this was effected after getting many of the fighting workers displaced. They are placing their demands to-day before the Arbitration Board constituted according to law. Even at this stage, the Railway Federation has accepted a cut in wages, has made no effective protest against the retrenchment of 10,000 railway workers. In spite of all the things that are happening before them—the shootings, the retrenchment and reduction of wages, these representatives of Labour do not feel that they are playing the game of the capitalists and thereby perpetuating misery, enslavement and hunger. The only things that they get for the workers are worsened conditions, while they passively submit to all repressive laws like the Trades Disputes Bill that penalises strikes. While some of them are selected every year by the Government for the Geneva Labour Conference, others amongst them are enjoying a seat at the R. T. C. as representatives of Labour in India.

The workers always rally round organisations that fight for their cause not through compromises and Arbitration Boards but by a militant and relentless fight against the capitalist class, as for instance the militant fighting policy of the Red Flag Union in Bombay attracted all the workers who were rallying round such a policy, while at the same time they abandoned the hesitating, halting and half-hearted lead given by Messrs. Joshi & Co. When a genuine organisation was ready to take up their cause they readily accepted its lead. While those that advocated the policy of conciliation have been elevated to seats in the Assembly as nominated members on behalf of Labour, (Mr. N. M. Joshi) and others are getting the best out of the capitalist Governments of Europe, enjoying the status of labour representatives at Geneva.

The R. I. L. U. is a body co-ordinating and uniting the militant and fighting Trade Union organisations of the world, and stands for revolutionary action in spite of conciliation and compromise—the watchword of the bourgeois reformist leaders. These bourgeois Labour leaders crave for the good wishes of capitalist owners while at the

same time pretending to fight for the cause of Labour. They cannot sincerely carry out the tasks they profess because of their contradictory affiliations. The result is that the workers are betrayed by these Reformist leaders. It is for this that the R.I.L.U. has been organised—to fight against all reformism in the Trade Unions.

With reference to the letter from C. P. Dutt I may state that it was received by me through His Majesty's Post Office in Bombay and which was kindly passed on to me by the ever-vigilant C. I. D. I am glad that the W. P. P. of Bombay had an opportunity to discuss this letter and the questions raised therein.

One of the questions raised by Dutt was regarding the Bardoli Satyagraha Movement on which we had issued a manifesto. Dutt and others in England, who are interested in the fight of the Indian masses for emancipation and who are trying to enlist the sympathy of the British workers, were naturally interested in this struggle at Bardoli. In this connection I replied to Dutt, and later sent him the manifesto that I had issued on behalf of the Party, on this question.

The Bardoli fight was essentially a fight of the rich peasants who were utilising the lower strata of the peasantry in their fight against the landlord who in this case happened to be the Government. Their demand at first was for the suspension of increased revenue completely, but according as days passed by the demand was narrowed down to an impartial inquiry. The Bardoli Sardar was all along very anxious to make the position of the Satyagrahis quite clear. He went out of his way to state that there existed no class war. The lower strata of the peasantry and a higher one including the moneylenders had joined hands in this struggle against the Government. He was anxious to see that the peasant did not "break his word of promise" to fight legally, constitutionally and non-violently. While this pacifist leader was anxious to do all in his power to bring about a compromise, the Government as usual went on with the suppression of the movement, confiscated all the belongings of the small peasants who were left without anything. The speeches of the Sardar and other leaders of the Satyagraha Movement of the time are full of the tale of the richer peasantry and Vaniyas hesitating to join in the struggle. "A number of Vaniyas who had been from the very first shaky and on whom no notices were served paid up a part of the assessment." In another place "while the small landholders were ready to sign the pledge the bigger ones were hesitating." It has also been admitted by the leaders of the Satyagraha Movement that the agitation that was started was taken up by the serfs or *Dublas*, as they are called, and it really proved "infectious"; which meant that the movement was taken up by the lower strata of peasantry which naturally frightened the leaders into hastening the compromise, because this infection and restiveness was becoming too hot for these people.

In their speeches the leaders always maintained that they were not revolutionaries and that they should not be considered as "swarms of agitators". And in the compromise, as in all compromises, the Government did not yield to their demands. Only the poorer peasantry was hit hard because of the refusal of Government to go into the question of sold property—while most of the land was purchased back from people that had bought it. The Sardar ^{had} refused to see class struggle. He made this clear in a speech at Bombay after the signing of the Gandhi-Irwin Pact. He stated that the Satyagrahis did not recognise any class distinctions and hence it is no wonder that his party always sacrifices the interests of the wide masses to the interests of the zamindars and capitalists.

I made this point clear in the manifesto that was issued and sent it to Dutt giving reasons at the same time as to why we could not directly engage ourselves in this struggle.

There was another point raised in his letter by Dutt. He wanted to be kept informed of the strike situation in Bombay. The W. P. P. of Bombay was engaged in one of the most formidable strikes of the textile workers in Bombay. The hiring press of this country with its reporters like Mr. Macwan—the Prosecution witness directly in the pay of the police—conspired against the strikers and refused to publish authentic reports of the strike. In consequence of this, tales of rioting and attacks on innocent blacklegs of the mills by the strikers found great prominence in the press, while the real causes of the strike, the assaults of the owners on the strikers, and their sufferings were kept in the background.

What scanty news trickled through to the British workers was so misleading that it is no wonder that comrade Dutt wanted to know the real situation regarding the strike. The fact that the international proletariat was interested in the fight that was raging between the mill-owners and the textile workers in Bombay is proved by the enormous sums of money that were sent to the Joint Strike Committee in Bombay for the relief of the starving strikers. Dutt wanted to know our side of the affair. I sent him a reply to this furnishing him with all the information that he wanted.

The fact is that the sovereignty of His Majesty is so shaky and in constant danger of collapse that a special department of learned thieves has got to be engaged to support this crumbling structure. The various complaints that we have made to you regarding the delay in the delivery of our letters, and with regard to the letters that had been never delivered to us, should suffice to show how it is impossible for us to correspond with anybody. The means of communication, that is the posts and the telegraphs—the blessings of the British rule in India, are denied to us. Thieving, which is condoned by the Government, which pays liberally to the individuals for doing this job, I suppose is necessary to maintain the State. And if these benefits are denied to us I for one should stand for evading these. I am referring

to the question of what is known as cover addresses. I should think that cover addresses are justifiable under these circumstances.

Did Mr. Karanth receive any letters for me? I say no. "The interesting correspondence that he must have received" (Prosecution's Opening Address) may have been in the archives of the C. I. D. or it may have been in their brains. But I received no such letter.

P 2136 : is supposed to be the original of a cable sent to Dutt by me. As it is the telegram was unearthed months after our arrest. It is not in my handwriting. Apart from the fact that the evidence of the handwriting expert cannot be taken to be correct, history is full of accounts of forgeries of documents—as the Zinovieff Letter I have referred to elsewhere—and of the ingenuity and the unscrupulousness of the zealous police officers. It may be possible that certain necessary links may have been manufactured at the C.I.D. headquarters. We have had an instance of a Calcutta police officer swearing to a document as having been found at Calcutta which later was found to have emanated from this Garden House and which this obliging officer had never seen before. I am tempted to put certain of these doubtful documents to the credit of the unceasing efforts of Mr. Horton, the investigating officer in this case.

Money Orders.

There is in all a sum of £ 60 that was supposed to have been sent to me by one Ziese. I never knew about it until this trial. Things have a method of missing their way. Most of these letters etc. have strayed in the C.I.D. offices. What they did with these things none can tell excepting themselves.

Then there are certain names ascribed to me. Mr. Horton's wonderful imagination came to the rescue of the Prosecution where they could not make out the authors of certain letters. In one place I am Fb and in another I am George. The transposition code could not come to his rescue. So he had to fix upon some one of us as the authors of these letters. Father Ambrose was Spratt for some time. But later on it transpired that it was not Spratt. "Ghate in his usual name of George" says the Magistrate. I should have thought that it was an unusual name for me. But any way it does not seem to be necessary for them to prove anything. If they found it difficult to fix these pseudonyms on most of us, why, it should have been someone—who, though a member of the alleged conspiracy, was "intangible" because he gave one the impression of working behind the scenes—and all these names which could not fit any one else could easily be foisted upon one who was supposed to have worked behind the scenes. Since it is not necessary to have any proof, what really matters in this case is the imaginary connection that existed between the seller of pamphlets on the banks of the Ganges at Garhmukhtesar and the mighty halls of Kremlin.

The T. U. C.

I was one of the Assistant Secretaries of this body during the year 1927. Perhaps that by itself would not have been a crime if I had meekly submitted to and adopted the policy of Messrs. Joshi & Co., because they were having this Trade Union Movement in their hands with a view to improving the condition of labourers with compromise and goodwill between the employers and employees. The Trade Union Congress has hardly, if ever, supported a strike of the workers during the years before we became members of the T. U. C., and wherever it did support a strike it was always forced to do so and fight the cause of the strikers. The T. U. C. invariably attempted at sabotaging the workers' struggle and bringing about a compromise. The T. U. C. sessions became a debating society where all well-fed bourgeois reformist Labour leaders discussed points about the welfare of Labour in this country and vied with each other and fought for getting elected as Government nominees to Geneva. Because becoming a Trade Unionist had become an essential factor for getting a passport to Geneva for these reformists. And as our group was against this nomination and trip to Geneva the Joshi majority always managed to get things done in their own way. The Trade Union Congress under the leadership of these people looked to Geneva for guidance and blessing, while Geneva (I. F. T. U.) itself has always been content with flattering the capitalist Governments of all countries. Of course these reformists were thrown out at Nagpur with the forward march of the working-class. The Joshi group abandoned their former field of activities and turned their attention to a new Federation which they started after the break at Nagpur, quite secure with the support that they got from the Government. During the year 1927 I was elected one of the Assistant Secretaries of the T. U. C. during which period I was also elected as one of its delegates to the P.P.T.U.S. Conference at Canton. I was not allowed to proceed to Canton, thanks to the passport authorities for refusing me permission to go to that place. The reasons for such refusal are obvious. The P.P.T.U.S. also happens to be a revolutionary organisation fighting for the interests of the workers in all Pacific countries. The all-pervasive hand of Moscow being supposed to be at the bottom of this organisation also, the Imperialist Governments never allow the intermingling of colonial representatives at such conferences lest they too come under the Moscow influence. So I was not allowed to be infected with this Moscow poison. But at the same time if I had been elected as a delegate to the Asiatic Labour Conference sponsored by the Second International and boosted in this country by Messrs. Joshi & Co., I do not think any objection would have been raised though the mere fact of my being a Communist may have sufficed for a refusal of a permit for me.

Q. The following documents and evidence relate to your connection with the W. P. P. of Bombay, other W.P.P.s and the A.I.W.P.P.

- I. Bombay : P 1140, 1339, 1354 (4), 1354 (1) & (1) E, 1942, 1355 (7) A, B, C, D, E and F, 851, 1017, 847, 1353, 1329, 1343, 2517, 1355 (4), 809, 1290, 1847, 1348 (12), 1373 (16), 1252, 1373 (6), 1352 (2), 1358, 1685, 1373 (12), 1348 (48), P. W. 244, 1373 (7), 1348 (50) (41) (49) (20) (35) (26) (25) (13) (18) (15) (17) (24) (19) (21) (40) (14) (46) (44), 835, 1209, 1345, 1373 (11), 1348 (7) (39), 825, 824, 1348 (4) and (3), 1373 (13), 1348 (6) (16) (2), 416 (5), 549 (20), 1373 (19), 488, 1602, 1851 P, 1348 (10A), 1344, 1373 (17), 1365, 1373 (1), 1373 (14), 1348 (38), (=P 420), 1335, 1336, 1170, 1288, 1338, 1374, 1375, P. W. 269.
- II. A. I. W. P. P. : P 1373 (2), 1348 (5), 449, 2024C, 1348 (22), 1373 (3), 1626, 1617, 1323, 549 (20), 1373 (5) & 2084, 487, 1373 (4), 416 (4), 487, 1849 P, 1627 P, 421, 1348 (35), 1801, 1348 (36), 468 (2) (=P 2047P and P 2025P), P 1340, 1337, 1341, 1308, 1373 (9), (=669), 1763, 1764, 1348 (47), 459, 1302, 474, P. Ws. 36 and 254.
- III. Bengal W. P. P. : P 1339, 1370, 1333, 1356, 721, 1867, 1348 (3).
- IV. U. P. W. P. P. : P 1350 (1), (8), 1654 P, 1304, 1099, 1800.
- V. Punjab W. P. P. : P 1409, 1638, 1626, 1640, 1642, 2093, 1901 P, and 1895.

Have you anything to say in explanation of this evidence?

(Reply postponed for to-morrow).

D/19-12-31.

(The remaining evidence is also put to accused now at his request).

Q. The following documents relate to (1) your activities in connection with the A. I. T. U. C. (2) your activities in connection with the T.Us. and strikes (3) your connections generally.

(1) A. I. T. U. C. :—P 1494, 1383, 1847, 1878C, 1848C, 1348(30), P.Ws. 111 and 254.

(2) T.Us. and strikes:—P 954, 958, 959, 949, 1373(10), 1348(43), 482, 1346, 662, 776, 932, 964 and 985

(3) Connections and Miscellaneous:—P 1354(3), 2137P, 1470, 823, 1624, 821, 996, 2090, 2091, 1322, 1371, 146, 230, 1298, 1299, 1313, 1317, 1318, 1319, 1328, 1348(45), 1350(4), (6), (7), 1357, 1360, 1373(8A), (8B), (8C), (8D), (8E). Articles P1325, 1327, 1348 (42), 1361, 1373'20), 1348(37), 2527, 1314, 1315, P. W.s 215, 211 and 182.

Have you anything to say in explanation of the above evidence?

A. *The P. P. T. U. S. and the T. U. C.*

I have stated above that I was one of the Assistant Secretaries of the T. U. C. and that I was elected as a delegate to the Conference of the P.P.T.U.S. held at Canton in 1927. This organisation also is considered as one with which we should not associate. Its existence cannot be tolerated by Imperialist Governments. Its representatives are under constant surveillance as was Comrade Ryan, the Australian Delegate to the All-India Trade Union Congress held at Jharia. Ryan came to India as a representative from the P. P. T. U. S. to the Trade Union Congress asking the T.U.C. to affiliate itself to the P.P.T.U.S., which is the only militant organisation of revolutionary Trade Unions in the East,—co-ordinating and assisting in all the revolutionary struggles of the workers in the Pacific countries.

The P. P. T. U. S. was created on the initiative of the Australian Trade Unions. It is not a new International. It is an organisation comprising the Trade Union Movement of China, Australia, Philippines, Dutch East Indies, the militant section of the Japanese and American Trade Unions and the whole of the Trade Union Movement of the U.S.S.R. It comprises over 14 million organised workers from countries bordering on the Pacific.

The P. P. T. U. S. fights for world Trade Union unity and for the creation of a single united Trade Union International. It assists the oppressed peoples of the Pacific to liberate themselves from the Imperialist yoke. It also fights to remove all racial and national barriers and prejudices which still divide the exploited classes and the oppressed peoples to the advantage of exploiters and oppressors.

The Trade Union Congress refused to affiliate itself to this organisation during the session at Jharia. Because the T. U. C. by its very policy wanted to keep itself aloof from joining any militant organisations. If it was a question of affiliation to the Second International, probably Joshi & Co. would not have hesitated to do this. But seeing that there was a large section of Trade Unions in favour of affiliation to the R. I. L. U. the question of affiliating the T. U. C. to any organisation was thrust aside.

When the Trade Union Congress was forced to affiliate itself to the L. A. I. it was done in a half-hearted manner. The representative of the L. A. I. to the T. U. C. Session at Jharia—Johnstone was arrested when the Congress was in session. Hence as a protest against his arrest the T. U. C. found that it could not but affiliate to the L.A.I. But as far as the P. P. T. U. S. was concerned the Trade Union Congress kept itself aloof from affiliation to this revolutionary organisation until the split at Nagpur, when finally the position was clarified.

The Workers' and Peasants' Party of India.

This was organised at Calcutta at the first Conference held in 1928. I think this was the first attempt at uniting the different workers'

and peasants' parties in the country directed and controlled by one Central organisation. The different workers' and peasants' parties that had sprung up in Calcutta, Bombay and the Punjab were working independently though more or less with similar aims and objects. It was later found necessary to have one centralised party in the interests of united action, and hence the A. I. W. P. P. was formed. Its thesis which has been published must give you a clear idea of the aims and objects with which the Party was started—which were essentially different from those of the C. P. I. I was elected a member of the Central Executive of this All-India body. There was very little time for work by this organisation, since within a short time of its formation these arrests came, putting a stop to the activities of the Party. Its Executive could not meet at Amritsar because almost the whole of it was brought over to this city.

The W. P. P. of Bombay.

I was a member of this Party ever since its inception in 1927. I was also a member of the Congress Labour Group which was the predecessor of this organisation. The following year I was elected its Secretary, which office I held till the day of my arrest.

I must state that the W. P. P. of Bombay was a Party that stood for the complete independence of India from Imperialist domination. It was not, as has been suggested, working as a cloak for any other organisation. It could not possibly have been, because it was a two-class Party, while the C. P. I.—the Party of the working-class, could not have admitted of such contradictions. It stood for the national revolution and liberation of the country from Imperialist rule. The Party never pretended that it was going to establish the Dictatorship of the Proletariat in this country. Its policy was to work in alliance with the nationalist bodies, to develop the movement for national independence based upon the economic demands of the workers and peasants. It had decided to work within the Congress and exposed its reformist and insincere policy. The immediate work of the Party was to bring together the fighting and progressive forces from all sections of the people. There was no demand, as I said, with regard to the Dictatorship of the Proletariat or the establishment of the Communist society in its programme, and as such the C.P.I. could hardly use it as its cloak when it knew of the possibility of its being swamped by the other classes. The W. P. P. may have worked with the C. P. I. wherever there were common objects to be attained, but it never was any other party than what its name signifies. The existence of the W. P. P. was useful up to a certain period, after which, according as class contradictions were becoming more and more distinct, it had to break. Because of these contradictions it could not grow.

There is one point in this connection which I want to make clear. "Why did the Secretary of the Bombay Party run to the press with a contradiction of the Roy letter which was addressed to Muzaffar Ahmad?" says the Prosecuting Counsel in his Opening Address. The fact was that when the paper referred to letters addressed to the C. P. I. and the Workers' and Peasants' Party, the Party thought that they could not but contradict a letter which was never received by them. The W. P. P. considered the publication in the paper, and it was decided to issue the statement that the letter was an invention of the Government. The Party considered this as the Government's excuse for beginning an era of repression, which was justified by the events that followed—a rabid attack on the workers' movement, followed by the arrests of March 1929.

The W.P.P. of Bombay had to its credit the organisation and direction of the Trade Union Movement in Bombay. In fact its origin is to be found in what was known as the Congress Labour group—the Left section in the B.P.C.C. and which later transformed itself into a W.P.P. with a programme of action. It worked within the Congress, it worked in different Trade Unions, and it organised the workers to fight their bosses in militant Trade Unions. Its work in Bombay during 1928 is too well known. The organisation known as the G. K. U. was formed under the leadership of the Party. This Union is familiar to every one as the Red Flag Union and the lead that it gave to the workers in their post-strike development is entirely due to the programme chalked out by the Party.

Red Flag Union.

The Red Flag Union was able to rally militant workers on its side because of its fighting policy. It had already shown what it could do by the success it had achieved during the general strike of 1928. It had shown the workers that the road of compromise and conciliation was not going to bring them anything but worsened conditions. It had shown them that in their united effort and in their adoption of a fighting policy lay their salvation. It had taught them during the few months of its existence that the workers formed a class by themselves; that they were always in a chronic state of oppression by the other class which was professing sympathy with them; that for them there could not exist any religious distinctions, because the capitalists exploit them as workers bringing profits to themselves (owners) and not as so many people belonging to different religious sects—it had in short attempted to create class consciousness in them.

I was one of the treasurers of this Union. A lot of money was collected on behalf of the workers which was spent towards the maintenance of its volunteers and its offices, and in a number of strikes in individual mills that followed the general strike. It also maintained a

Volunteer Corps for the protection of the workers irrespective of religious distinctions during the Hindu-Moslem riots of 1929 February. It was during this period that it was found that the workers as far as they were concerned as a class kept themselves aloof from these religious dissensions. The Red Flag Union, thus, was putting up a fight for the rights of the workers as against the treachery of the mill-owners, who have been posing themselves as nationalists. The Red Flag Union gathered round it all the militant fighters who saw into the treacherous leadership of the B. T. L. U. which was a Union that stood for compromise and conciliation. The very fact that the B. T. L. U. ceased to exist excepting in name is a proof of this.

Here I must correct a wrong impression that has been given by the statement of Mr. Alwe. He was put up as a candidate for the Municipal elections along with the other members of the Workers' and Peasants' Party. As he says rightly his name was omitted from the list, but not for the reasons given by him.

It was the first time that we, as a Party, had definite evidence as to how these elections are run for the benefit of a particular class, when we came into it ourselves as candidates. In the first instance, it was very difficult to get publicity for the Party's candidates through the bourgeois press. Secondly, there was the incomplete electoral roll that was prepared by the Municipality. We found that the Municipal officers were not over-anxious about having all the citizens of the city in their lists. So the working-class section was almost omitted from the whole list, in spite of the fact that there was a large number of these who were qualified to vote. Consequently only a few of the workers found themselves in this list. This is a sad commentary on the much boasted local self-government that has been conceded to us by our Imperialist rulers. The myth of the very liberal franchise that was extended, stands exposed.

This being the case and Mr. Alwe's name not being in the electoral roll we could not but give up his candidature on behalf of the Party.

Finally I have only to say that maddened by power the Government has plunged into a policy of repression hitherto unknown in India. The Imperialist rulers have been terrified out of their wits. Not all their repression nor the hesitating leadership of the national bourgeoisie has been able to stem the tide of the movement for liberation of the Indian people. The frantic efforts that the Government is making at the suppression of socialist thoughts and ideas cannot be checked. Repression only assists in the growth of the revolutionary idea. For a time it may be that repression may hold out but it cannot stay the onward march of the revolution.

In this case itself, the working-class movement has received an impetus which probably would not have been possible in so short a time.

The interest in Communism and Communist ideology is spreading like wild fire throughout the country. So whatever attempts the Government may make at suppressing the rising workers' movement for liberation, they will not be successful. It is possible that the Government thinks that it will win by the incarceration of a few of us because it cannot tolerate a victory of the Comintern. Right or wrong the prestige of the Government must be kept up.

The results of the election and the feverish haste with which the Government has started wreaking vengeance on the Indian freedom movement are already revealing themselves in the continued breaches of the Delhi Pact on the part of the Government; the Government that has promulgated twelve ordinances during this year—and before the year is out it may have some more; the Government that is, by its latest Bengal Ordinance, trying to strike terror amongst the "dumb millions"; the Government that has been trying to translate its trusteeship into action by arming its officers with all military powers authorising them to shoot if necessary any suspect or those that they may consider as dangerous; the Government that has promulgated the U. P. Ordinance in the teeth of the compromise that the Congress offered, making the existence of the lower strata of peasantry in U. P. insecure; the Government that is to-day putting the peasants into prison and shooting them, while talking of compromise with Gandhi in London.

But will this victory of the Government be the final one? The answer is furnished in the development of forces in our country from which there is no escaping. The attempts of the Government, desiring to avert the crisis in the railways, may have prompted them to appoint a Conciliation Board; but hardly had the Board sat down to its work than the Agent of the N. W. R. announced a retrenchment of ten thousand workers. Again, it may be that the Government is attempting economy, and still it is compelled to spend all these savings and much more on the attack of the "Burmese rebels" and on the maintenance of extra police and military in Bengal and U. P. These are contradictions from which no one can escape. The mad rush for repression can but only hasten the destruction of the present order; the historical forces at work never stop because they happen to be unwelcome to the present capitalist order. It may be the desire of a particular State that its actions should never be questioned; that its position as the protector of the dumb millions must be accepted as the only right thing.

It appears that a live Communist is a chronic danger to the State. It is only when a Communist is dead, he ceases to be a danger to the State. Because according to the Prosecution a Communist wherever he lives is bound to do propaganda and interpret the actions of the Government in a way unpalatable to them. The propaganda of the Government which otherwise would have a free hand is countered by a more scientific, all-embracing propaganda in favour of the oppressed and

exploited. This position becomes intolerable to a Government that always wants the masses to believe that they are existing in their interest. A Lord Rothermere can advocate the cause of the dumb millions, but when it comes to the question of a Communist advocating the cause of the oppressed people he deserves to be shot. It does not matter whether we have committed any overt or illegal act; it does not matter whether we belong to the C. P. I. or whether the C. P. I. was affiliated to the C. I., it is probably the big idea that we had and have—the establishment of a Communist society. On the whole one gets an impression that the Prosecution have made much of our attempt at overthrowing the doubtful sovereignty of unstable kingship. Kingship is a memento of the past feudal order. Monarchy has been destroyed with the rise of the bourgeoisie. It is the bourgeoisie that has put an end to that order. In whichever country monarchy has been maintained, it has been allowed to exist only as a convenient institution, and as such has always been at the mercy of the capitalist class. No sooner has kingship become inconvenient, it has been swept aside. With the advance of world revolution the last relics of kingship will be swept away and kings flung onto the dung heap of history, while the victorious proletariat will create a new social order, a new society. This change is inevitably drawing nearer under the leadership of the Communist Party of India under the guidance of the Communist International.

(Sd.) R. L. Yorke.

Q. You have now read over your statement and it has been amended and corrected as and where requested by you. Are you now satisfied that the above record is correct?

A. Yes.

(Sd.) R. L. Yorke,
5-1-32.

(Sd.) S. V. Ghate,
5-1-32.

Certified that the above is a full and true record of the statement of the accused taken down by stenographers in my presence and hearing, and subsequently transcribed by them and corrected and amended as and where requested by the accused, and admitted by him to be correct.

(Sd.) R. L. Yorke,

5-1-32.

Corrected by [Signature] True by [Signature]

Purault

H